

POSTAGE, Paid in Advance, 4 Cts. per No. or 16 Cts. per Year.

DANVILLE REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

In Association of Ministers.

J U N E, 1 8 6 4.

Πατίσαντος δὲ ζῶν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

DANVILLE, KY.

PRINTED FOR THE ASSOCIATION AND SOLD BY
MOORE, WILSTACH & BALDWIN,
25 WEST FOURTH STREET,
CINCINNATI.

SOLD ALSO BY WM. S. & A. MARTIN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT CARTER &
BROTHERS, NEW YORK; LITTLE, BROWN & CO., BOSTON;
KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; BIBLE AND
TRACT HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1862, by JACOB COOPER, for the Association,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I.—THE BIBLE NOT A TEXT BOOK ON NATURAL SCIENCE. By Prof. O. N. Stoddard. - - - - -	187
II.—THE BIBLE CONSIDERED AS CAUSE TO AN EFFECT, OR AS MEANS TO AN END. By Rev. H. H. Hopkins. - - - - -	201
III.—THE MEANING AND USE OF סֵלָה (SELAH). By R. W. Landis, D. D. - - - - -	214
IV.—PERJURY EXEMPLIFIED IN SECESSION. By Rev. Jacob Cooper, Ph. D. - - - - -	248
V.—THE MEN OF DANVILLE.—No. II. By J. A. Jacobs, Esq. - - - - -	274
VI.—EXPERIMENT IN TRANSLATION OF THE TALMUD— VALUABLE THINGS IN THE TALMUD. By Rev. J. R. Miller. - - - - -	310
VII.—THE DIVINE ORIGIN AND SUPREMACY OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT. By Rev. S. A. Mutchmore. - - - - -	327

NOTE TO OUR PATRONS.—The delay in the issue of the June number has been occasioned by the departure of the hundred days' volunteers, through which our publishers were so stripped of their force that they could with extreme difficulty print for us at all, and then only slowly, and with repeated interruptions. We hope, however, our subscribers will bear with us through sympathy with the patriotic movement which occasioned the delay. We would also remind our patrons that the prices of printing and materials used by publishers have advanced 200 per cent., and that we have to pay cash. This renders it necessary that we be paid punctually, and may require an advance in price soon, as the highest rate now charged by us scarcely covers cost of publication.



DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. II.

JUNE, 1864.

ART. I.—*The Bible not a Text Book on Natural Science.*

THAT the Bible was not intended by its author to discuss and explain the various topics of Natural Science, will be admitted by most, if not all, of the careful readers of its pages. Any elaborate discussion of the subject, briefly, though imperfectly, stated in the heading of this article, is therefore unnecessary. Yet, objections are urged against this book because its scientific allusions are not more technical and in detail. Now, if it can be shown that it does not, and can not, consistently with its professed character, enter into scientific details, the objection disappears. The principle which underlies this discussion is, that the Bible uses the facts of science, so far as they are pertinent to its main design, without any attempt to explain the laws of the facts. This principle will be found to have an application to other subjects than scientific ones. Any one, who chooses to pursue the investigation, will discover that it is adhered to in the Bible upon every subject with singular tenacity, and is a marked characteristic of the work. A fuller recognition of this principle would save much unreasonable clamor and needless disputes. The Bible teaches plainly and explicitly what it most concerns us to know, but it does even this with wonderful brevity.

This article may prepare the way for another, showing what rule of interpretation should be adopted in explaining those subjects in the word of God, which involve scientific questions.

It is obvious, if it be the design of Revelation to instruct men in the laws and phenomena of Science, that the investigation and

explanations should be absolutely exhaustive, for nothing less would be in keeping with its claims. Any thing short of this would be held an imperfection, and so charged against the Bible. It must be in advance of man's possible knowledge in all time to come, otherwise its claim of perfection would be discovered to be a cheat.

Let us examine for a little, and see what method the Bible does pursue upon scientific subjects.

When God, in the thirty-eighth chapter of Job, propounds a variety of questions—most of them of a scientific nature—He offers not the slightest explanation of any of them, though so numerous are the natural phenomena referred to in that chapter that a partial elucidation, even, would fill many volumes.

"Where is the way where light dwelleth," is inquired, but no information is given; and yet here is the place, had God so designed, to instruct us as to the origin and nature of light.

Which of the two great theories of light is true, might have been settled forever by a single sentence from its Creator. "Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth?" we listen, but not a word in reply is given as to its size and form.

"Who hath divided the water courses?" and still no answer. And to the present time geologists are discussing the formation of hills and valleys.

"Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?" is asked; but neither the nature, distances or uses of the bodies embraced in these constellations, are stated. Many valuable facts are indeed implied, and it is an interesting item of history that the stars were grouped into constellations at that early day.

That inimitable illustration, by the growth and adornment of the lily, of God's care of even trivial objects—hence much more of intelligent, responsible man—gives no phytological explanation of the laws of growth, or botanical classification of the lily; or of the principle which governs its harmony of colors; or why such a beautiful adaptation of its colors and our tastes to each other. A great fact, however, far more important than any scientific laws of growth in plants and animals, does lie nestled in this beautiful figure. It is that Nature's laws, as we sometimes irreverently call them, are but modes in which God works in the material world. They are recognized as laws by us, because of their

uniformity and constancy. And how the human mind can so readily stop at modes of working, and fail to see, perhaps may even deny the existence of the worker, is a puzzle, or rather would be, were there not also revealed certain great facts touching the tendencies of that mind.

When God, after the Deluge, assures Noah that a like catastrophe shall not again visit the earth, and gives the "bow in the cloud" as a seal to His promise, He leaves us in utter ignorance as to the manner in which the bow is produced. There is not even a hint that light is the agent concerned. Nor does He inform us whether the bow did or did not exist before that time. We are at perfect liberty to settle the question by determining whether the same conditions of rain and sunshine existed before as after the flood. The wonderful longevity in ancient times, and the causes which have reduced the term of human life to threescore years and ten, and the average to half that, are great scientific facts which we long to know; but which, if produced by secondary causes, lie hid from us in the mysteries of our being. Physiologists may assert that the present length of human life is necessarily the result of our constitution; that laws of growth and decay must reach their climax and decline in about seventy years; in fine, that the body is so constituted that it must wear out in about that period; and that though great care and moderation may adjourn the hour for a little when its beautifully adjusted forces shall cease to play, and its consummate mechanism shall be shattered beyond the power of any but the Divine Architect to restore, yet that its life could extend to a thousand years, is impossible. To all this the Bible deigns no reply. It leaves its simple statements of scientific facts, or its allusions to them, without proof or argument. As a man, conscious of his truthfulness, never asserts that he is no liar, but, in dignified silence, bides his time; so the Bible leaves its facts to be believed or disbelieved, as the reader may choose. Amid the heavings of human passion, and giant struggles of human intellect, it awaits the decisions of time. Those heavings and struggles may beat against its wall of adamant, but they find it unmoved and immovable. The account of the Deluge exhibits the same, we might say, studied avoidance of every thing which would appear like instructing the scientific engineer in the deep mysteries and physical laws of that terrific ruin. "The fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the rain was

upon the earth forty days and forty nights," is all the scientific explanation which God gives of one of the greatest epochs in human history.

That gush of waters which thrilled with unutterable agony the hearts of all earth, and stifled the breath of a world, remains to this day an inexplicable mystery in science. A few verses record, with unaffected sympathy, the most terrible catastrophe, excepting the crucifixion, which ever darkened the earth's surface. It is natural, nay it is hard at times not to wish that some brief explanation had been given of the means by which the result was attained. But it is best as it is. Something far more valuable is bestowed than the most elaborate unfolding of the physical operations concerned in the Deluge. The statement as it stands in its simplicity, singleness of purpose and conscious truthfulness, secures the confidence of every impartial reader. We enter upon no investigation here, whether the terms expressing the universality of the Deluge were or were not used by the writer in the sense we generally attach to the corresponding terms in our translation.

That is a question for philologists to settle. If they, after careful investigation, decide that the original words apply as often to a part as to the whole of a thing, then we are at liberty to consider the Deluge partial or universal, as future investigations may, if they can, determine. No Christian need perplex his mind about it. Let him accept the great fact of the overthrow, for the purpose assigned, of the world which then was, the Bible taxes his belief no further. With a wisdom, very significant, it binds us to no philosophical theories in physics, but rises above them in its sublime generalizations. It invites and challenges the fullest and freest research in the rich fields of Science. It is, indeed, a generous-hearted old Book, inviting to the largest liberty of thought and action consistent with holy living, strong in its conscious truth and abiding power. It utters great principles, not in morals only, but even in its incidental allusions to Science, and then bids the intellect and heart search and find in God's great domain of truth.

But let us glance at another of those singular phenomena, at which some have scoffed. We refer to that strange occurrence when the sun and moon stood still at the command of Joshua. We have nothing to say to those who make it highly-wrought figurative language. To such the event presents no difficulty. But,

viewing it as a scientific fact, though miraculous, we find the same absence of any design to instruct in physical laws. "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou Moon, in the valley of Ajalon," is an expression of remarkable brevity for so remarkable an event. The language is undoubtedly phenomenal; it merely states the occurrence as it appeared to an observer on the earth. The Sun and Moon retained apparently the same place in the heavens for about the space of a day. Not the slightest clue is given to aid us in deciding how the apparent progress of the Sun was suspended for a season. The solution of the problem, as far as physical laws are concerned, is a legitimate inquiry of Science.

It is not within the design of this article to explain this event. It may not, however, be amiss to remark briefly, that if any of the laws which govern the relation of the earth to the sun were used in this miracle, the suspension of its axial rotation seems the most probable. The objection, often urged, that it would be impossible to do this in a short time without ruin to all movable bodies on its surface, is valid only on condition that the arresting force should be applied to the solid earth alone, and should act, not with a gradual increase of intensity, but in full power at once, and should be so great as to stop the rotation almost instantly.

Allow the objector to fix these his own conditions, and the effects stated would follow. Movable bodies at the equator would rush to the east with a velocity of nearly one thousand miles an hour. The principle which governs problems of this class is, that the time and force necessary to give to a body, starting from rest, any required velocity, but so gradually as to produce no shock, will, if employed to stop the motion, bring the same body to rest, also, without shock or violence. If the force be applied, not merely to one portion of the body, but to every particle within and upon it, then the conditions of the problem are quite simple enough to admit of a solution. A man may fall toward the earth, and were there no atmosphere to resist his rapidly increasing velocity, no shock would be felt. There would be no tendency to pull the body in pieces, for every particle would be urged downward with equal force. Except by comparison with other bodies, he would not know that he was in motion, or that it was increasing to a frightful degree. The aeronaut, floating in his balloon at the rate of sixty miles an hour, seems to himself, unless the earth be visible, to be suspended at rest in mid air. The

velocity of the earth at the equator is about one thousand miles an hour, and a body falling toward it would, if not resisted, acquire that velocity in forty-five seconds. The same force which can give that motion without violence, is capable of destroying it in the same time without violence. If then a force, sufficient in degree, were to act in a direction contrary to the earth's rotation, upon every particle of matter within and upon it, its motion would be arrested without shock in forty-five seconds. Of course, it is not for Science to say in what way the occurrence was produced, but it may remove objections, and show that this or that mode is possible.

The important fact bearing upon this discussion is, that the Bible, in its statement of the miracle, utterly ignores all explanation.

A scientific fact, mentioned in the Bible, whether miraculous or not, is naturally left to Science to interpret. It comes within the scope, not of the word, but of that other volume, not written, but seen daily in Nature's laws and operations. Miracles, if without the pale of known laws, are inexplicable. We see nothing but the fact; its antecedents, if there are any between it and God, are hidden from view. It is a mistake to suppose that no event is miraculous, unless it involves a suspension of the ordinary laws which govern matter and mind. There may be higher laws which occasionally step forth into the wide arena of God's providences, produce their results, and then disappear from us in their grand cycle of revolution. New combinations of known laws may produce effects unattainable by any other means. The miracle, then, consists in the combination. Or the occurrence may be strictly natural in the means used, but miraculous as to time and circumstances. The cloud which rose from the Mediterranean, at the prayer of Elijah, and watered the parched land, was formed probably as all other clouds are, but its happening at that particular juncture, and in answer to prayer, was more than a mere coincidence—it was miraculous. True, those events which are ordinary in their nature, but special in time, we sometimes call particular providences. To our view they may seem miracles of a lower order than others; and it may, in some cases, be difficult to determine whether they are or are not mere coincidences. In God's view, however, they may be just as miraculous in their adaptation to time and circumstances, as the raising of Lazarus from the dead. We may be altogether too skeptical as to God's interpo-

sition at the present day in man's behalf. We are not prepared to say that He works no miracle now for the benefit of His people. Unreasonable skepticism is quite as bad as unreasoning credulity. A fuller sense of God's ever-abiding presence and activity, even in secondary causes—less of readiness to shut out all recognition of a Divine agent, by substituting a law for the agent—would connect our own age more closely with the Apostolic. Perhaps we have assented too readily to the prevalent idea, that God has ceased, except in a very general and roundabout way, to interfere and coöperate in man's affairs. Ordinary agencies are his messengers as truly as extraordinary; and their constancy and uniformity by no means divest them of their intimate relation to Him. Why should the constant turning of the earth on its axis make it any less a Divine work, than if it were to turn but once? And yet while the world would stand awe-struck at the latter, it finds no difficulty in accounting for the first by a law of Nature.

The account of the creation, in the 1st chapter of Genesis, follows the same general course, in merely stating facts, as the cases already cited. It is not our business now to interpret the language of that remarkable history. Whether the terms "create, make, and let there be," denote arrangement, or absolute creation; whether the word translated "day" means, in the original, a common day of twenty-four hours, or a period of great but indefinite length, must be settled mainly on philological grounds. If the terms admit of either interpretation, then the geological record may be appealed to to decide which shall be accepted. So far as the language in which the statements are made can be shown to admit of but one meaning, then adopt that. Let doubtful points be held as such, till some new light from the Bible or from Science shall remove the doubt. In the mean time it is plain from the narrative, that the arrangement of the world in its present form is claimed to be God's work, and that certain portions of the whole were allotted for execution to each of the six periods. Whether any, and what portion was accomplished by ordinary physical agencies; whether the first verse states the fact of absolute creation of the heavens and earth, while the others denote the arrangement of the materials in their present form; whether the periods are twenty-four hours each, or ages, may, perhaps without detriment, be held *sub judice*, till Science and Philology shall have made greater advances.

While the Bible leaves us in no doubt as to the Being who has constructed and beautified this, our habitation, it gratifies no curiosity as to the mode. This we are at liberty to find out, if we can. If such a discovery should prove to be beyond the reach of our minds, then we can reverently admit our inability, and adore the profound mystery of the work. The Bible does reveal, in Science as well as Theology, some of the most astonishing facts ever presented to the human mind. But any explanation of them it wisely leaves in obscurity. They are great problems, on which we may task our powers, if we do it in a proper spirit. What God has revealed more or less perfectly, is not too sacred for our investigation. We best honor the Revelator by searching into those deep things to which he has given us the clue.

The Christian, who is startled at the assertion that the Bible does not explain scientific phenomena, even to the extent our text books do, should estimate the consequences if its adherence to that which forms the grand burden of its message should be departed from.

Suppose we allow the Geologist to bring forward his claim. He insists that God should have given and explained in the Bible the great facts of Geological Science; the age of the world; the remarkable changes through which it has passed; the appearance and disappearance of the gigantic and strange beings that have vexed its surface; and the preparation, by the action of the physical forces through interminable ages, of the earth for man's advent; and, finally, the ushering him in, with a majesty suited to the occasion, as lord of this lower creation. With equal propriety might the Astronomer urge, that an impartial Being could not overlook that noblest and grandest of all the Natural Sciences—Astronomy; that the law of gravitation should have been communicated to Adam; that it is very singular that man should have been permitted to remain for fifty-seven centuries in ignorance of that force which sweeps universal space with its energies, and holds all matter in common brotherhood.

If these claimants are satisfied by compliance, then we see not why the mechanical philosopher may not plead that a brief treatise should have been inserted upon the nature and action of the physical forces, the mechanical powers, the construction of machines from the simplest to the most complex. Besides, as mere descriptions of machines are nearly useless, Divine Power could as

readily, and therefore should, have constructed models, from imperishable materials, of all machines that ever have been or can be useful to man. To render the whole accessible, He might have dug out the granite heart of the Himalaya and lighted it with a few volcanoes, and in this, as a great patent office, might have been deposited more than the human mind could ever invent, and all that it could ever use. To this—more than a Mecca—might the world have resorted for all mechanical knowledge. Then the race would not have groped its way in darkness, till old age had furrowed its visage, without even the common instruments of civilization within its reach.

But if improvements and inventions, pertaining to matter only, should have a place in the sacred volume, much more should those subjects pertaining to mind and morals, and to governments. Why should not the Divine pen have written out a complete analysis and classification of the different mental operations? Why not have settled those vexed questions, whether the will is self-determining, or is controlled by some power lying back of it? Why not have explained how God can govern and man be free? How the Divine can be associated with human nature; indeed, how mind can be associated with matter at all, and each exert an influence upon the other? Why not have given the best form of government for different stages of civilization, with the various offices and the functions belonging to each case? Historically, several different forms of government are mentioned in the Scripture narrative, but no obligation is imposed upon nations to follow expressly either or any of them. Moral principles, also, are established on a foundation as simple as it is grand and immovable. While the 20th chapter of Exodus does record something more nearly like a system of morals than is found elsewhere, and the Sermon on the Mount constructs a perfect character upon that system; yet there is very little of detail. Great principles are thrown out, so comprehensive in their grasp, that no details in human life or relation can fall without their pale. A more sublime generalization is not on record than our Saviour's summary of all duty in the comprehensive precepts, Love to God and Love to man.

The *history* of the Bible is made to bend to the same unswerving purpose—man's redemption.

It is fragmentary or continuous, or sketches in masterly outline, just as the necessities of the case may demand. How full must

the sixteen centuries before the flood have been of startling events, exhibiting the depravity of man, the forbearance and the justice of God! But what is the historical record of that period? Simply the creation of the earth and of the first pair; their fall, and expulsion from the Garden; the birth of Cain and Abel; the murder of the latter; the probable apostasy of Cain, and the corruptions from intermarriage with his descendants; the translation of Enoch; a genealogical table; the announcement of the flood, and the command to build the ark. Brief directions are given as to the construction of the ark; but the one hundred and twenty years of Noah's labor upon it, and of his preaching, are passed without comment. And the terrible engulfing of all life in the gurgling waters with its untold horrors, is expressed in a few verses. Not a relic of those times has been handed down along with the old coat of Treves and the Virgin's milk, to gratify the curiosity of the new world, or to excite the wondering gaze of the faithful. The history of that period stands in majestic outline, quite enough to show the ways of God to man, but no more. From Noah down to Abraham there are snatches of history. A covenant is made with Noah; the dispersion and settlement of his descendants is stated; Nimrod is pointed out as the founder of a great monarchy; the tower of Babel rises; confusion of tongues arrests the work and plants the germs of many nations. All is again silent; centuries flee; and the Assyro-Babylonian monarchy, the head of gold in Daniel's historical image, and the first of his four beasts, looms up on the great sea of time, flashing in gold, and again it is gone. Like some noble man-of-war, it is seen to rise on the crested wave, its white sails gleam in sunlight, the foam is hurled from its sides, and it sinks in the troubled waters. Time sweeps onward; the Medo-Persian rides the wave, its silver light dazzling for the time all beholders. The silver arms and breast of the image, and the bear, the second of the beasts, have received their fulfillment. But it, too, has passed, and the Greek, the classic, the tasteful, the polished Greek, the brazen belly of the same image, and the eagle-winged beast, follows next in order, and it also disappears. And well it might, for behind there comes slow moved, but in terrible might, overshadowing and crushing, and absorbing into itself, every thing along its pathway, the Roman Dominion, shadowed forth by the massive iron legs of the image, and by the fourth beast, diverse from the others, having

iron teeth and claws of brass. But look again: the eleven hundred years of its dominion and corruption have passed without a word to mark its progress, when a little stone appears. It breaks forth from the mountain without hands; onward it sweeps; the iron image boldly plants itself across its path; the shock shakes the earth, and the iron and the brass are ground to powder, and scattered like the chaff of the summer threshing floor. And now the little stone becomes a great mountain, and fills the whole earth. Such are the statements of the Word of God with reference to the grand events of time—prophetic once, now historical—symbolized in such masterly touches, that the philosopher and the barbarian can alike understand them. Even the confused tongues of Babel can all translate them. True, there are brought together things remote in time and place; but the only object is to give the relations of the events to each other, and the length of the periods is unimportant for this purpose. We, by our industry, may fill up some of these chasms, these long and apparently silent periods. But the Bible, in what it has done, has accomplished its work with the strokes of a master. Injustice may be done to it by claiming that its graphic outlines and sketches of history constitute a full and complete narrative.

Upon many of its brief and majestic statements, much light may sometimes be thrown by profane history. The correctness of what it does say of the governments and personages of ancient times, is more and more confirmed by modern research.

From the plains of Shinar many witnesses are rising up to bear testimony with Daniel and Isaiah and John. And the laws of Nature, when truly interrogated, fall into line with the scientific facts of the Word. Its historical voices are the mingled roar of some distant battle. We know little of the strategy, or of the movements and counter movements of the strife; but we do know that mighty forces are moving on to victory. Its brilliant but scattered lights are the light-houses which border the ocean of time, revealing its lofty headlands and resistless currents. But of the murmurs of wave and city, which are ever rising from its rock-bound coasts, and of the mysteries of its profound depths, nothing is revealed. But unless we falsely interpret the known, it can never conflict with the unknown. Allow, then, human research to fill up that great outline of history wisely left in blank. It will be but the fitting of pictures in a frame-work of gold.

In investigating the relations which the Bible bears to Science, two classes of errors are to be guarded against: One is, claiming for it what its Author never intended it to be—an expounder of Science, or even of the history of the world in full. This view compels him who adopts it, to reject much of Science and history which the mind has discovered and collected.

It makes him fearful of every advance in Science; fearful of the testimony which its laws bear in behalf of their Author, lest they should conflict with his interpretation of the Bible, and reveal some truths not found in it. Geology is considered almost a profane subject, because it seems to state facts in regard to the progress of life upon the earth, about which the Scriptures may be entirely silent. The Natural Philosopher, in his reverence for the grand laws which control the universe of matter, is regarded as a semi-idolator. A distinction is also taken between the revelation of God's character in His Word and works. The former is truly held as worthy of all acceptance; the latter may be neglected, if not decried, with impunity. True, all that concerns our moral relations to God is of paramount importance; but this, by no means, implies the right to treat other relations scornfully or even lightly. We dare not speak or think contemptuously of the great record of past events, which lies folded in the earth's crust. The leaves of that magnificent volume which were deposited beneath us, as they fell from the hands of Deity, graven with the records of the mighty past, challenge our admiration. Men may put foolish interpretations upon, or foist their foolish notions into the revelations of God's power in earth and sky—so they have done and still may do the same in the revelation of His Word; but that shall not shake our confidence in either. Man's follies are separable from God's wisdom, and it is not necessary to nurse the folly to save the wisdom. Even Christians sometimes speak as flipperily and discourteously of Science and its laws, as if it had been assigned to some malign being to arrange and control, for the express design of thwarting the Divine purpose. These are the men of narrow minds; good men, it may be, in the main, as good at least as they know how to be, but who can never rise to the conception of lofty truths and extended generalizations.

The other error arises among those who take advantage of the claim made informally by the friends of the Bible, that it is an

encyclopedia; but finding that it does not correspond to this description, nor even pretend to, they reject it altogether.

Perhaps they are not so much to blame for this as those who present the false issue, for they only accept an advantage unwisely tendered them by the friends of Revelation. Nevertheless, it should be plain to the most common apprehension, that it is an excellence in any author to pursue his main design without being turned from it by any allurements. Still more should this excellence be recognized when it is seen that pearls, which he is not now seeking, are strewn all along his pathway, but that his unfaltering march is nowise delayed by the temptation to gather them. He shows his appreciation of them by scattering them in showers whenever it suits his purpose, but he neither stops to analyze their properties nor to state their value. Moreover, when these persons speak of Science in general terms, they strictly conform, in their mode of expression, to the scientific language of the Bible. Why they should think a certain form of expression proper and truthful when used by themselves, but improper and untruthful when employed in the Bible, is hard to tell. It seems very strange, too, that they can not see that this book stands illustrious among all the writings of ancient and modern times in the singleness of purpose with which it works out its majestic problem. Stranger still that those very traits which do place it immeasurably above all human compositions, should be charged as faults which render it unworthy of confidence. Besides, it does seem that there is an eagerness, not usual in the sincere searcher for truth, to find conflicts between Revelation and Science. At times they adopt, with a readiness unbecoming a philosopher, theories in Science which are very crude, and rest on the smallest modicum of evidence; and often these theories are held with a tenacity proportioned to the scantiness of the testimony.

We do not blame one for believing any fact in Science when proved beyond reasonable doubt. It is not so much the belief in well ascertained facts in Revelation and Science that gives rise to controversy between the professed friends of each, as the wrong interpretation put upon the facts. Galileo was right in asserting that the earth turned on its axis; and the conflict between his views and those of the Roman Hierarchy was not between Revelation and Science, but between Science and their interpretation of Revelation. Christians might be a little more careful not to

insist too positively, in doubtful cases, upon a meaning which the text does not absolutely require.

In the mean time let them adjourn such scientific questions pertaining to the Bible, as are yet involved in doubt, until the laws and facts touching them are firmly established.

They may rest assured that, under a proper interpretation of these two Revelations of God's will, no conflict can occur. Both are His work and dear to His heart. Both shall survive the malice and the assaults of foolish men, and to both shall finally be awarded the honors of a magnificent triumph.

Many of our difficulties, in harmonizing truth from various sources, arise from our inability to survey the whole field at once. Even partial success is attained only after we have taken different stand-points, and compared and grouped together the leading thoughts which make up the whole. We may stand on the seashore; a boundless waste of waters lies before us, ever heaving majestically under some mighty force, ever dashing in sullen murmurs, and ever dying along the shore. Are there not a multitude of ideas, all of which are necessary to fill out this sublime conception of the ocean? Is it the mere water which lies within our limited horizon? Does not the mind wander to the cliffs of old Albion, where the surges are forever fretting away their life in vain attempts to blot out this gem of the ocean? Do we not stray among the ice crags of the poles, or pass quickly over the tropics scorching and gleaming like molten brass? And then do we not plunge down into its depths, where no storm ever reaches, away from the conflicts which chafe its surface? And do we not linger here in this splendid mausoleum of its innumerable tribes, which give honorable burial to the helpless, and utters one continued requiem over the lost? Now there rises up before us the ghosts of the old Phenicians, and Troy, and Carthage and Tyre; and sweeping down to the present, we hear the roar and the dash of the proud leviathans that now fill every sea. And then, and not till then, will the grand conception of grand old ocean fill the heart well nigh to bursting. Need we apply this figure? So that mind which, according to its ability, has swept with keen glance the whole field of knowledge, feeling that there is nothing so minute as to be despised; nothing so lofty that it may not be reverently approached; that mind obtains a view of God as much above the common lot, as the conception of the ocean, just described, sur-

passes that of the child who hears the rivulet babbling by its own door.

If men would examine the teachings of Revelation and Science, with this large comparison of all their subjects, and with childlike docility, there would be masters in Science, and masters in the mysteries of Redemption, who would be free from the narrow views of the bigot on the one hand; and on the other, from the poisonous and chilling imaginings of the infidel. No mind can ever rise to the glory of which it is capable, till it can cheerfully submit itself to all the teachings with which God has surrounded it.

ART. II.—*The Bible considered as Cause to an Effect; or Means to an End.*

OUR argument here will not be with Atheists, but Theists. The doctrine of cause and effect is intuitive to the human mind. It is among the first developments of human thought. Nor does time nor culture add much to the strength of this original perception; and it is upon this original and intuitive perception of reason that the human mind bases its necessary ideas of a Creator. Cause and effect considered, not metaphysically, but in fact, constitute a large portion of the ideas and knowledge of mankind. All Divine and Natural causes have three invariable qualities. They are: *permanent, efficient, and adapted to the end.* But, if this be true throughout the material universe, is it equally true in regard to the Bible? We assert that it is so, to the utmost jot and tittle. Wherever the Bible goes, its uniformity, efficiency and adaptation are as manifest in its effects as any thing can be. And if, by a necessity of reason, we attribute the operations of Nature to an infinitely wise, powerful and good God, by what perversion of judgment are we to refuse or to avoid the same conclusion in regard to the Bible? If the laws and operations of Nature lead us back to a Divine origin, then also, and inevitably, we are conducted by the same argument to the same conclusion in regard to the Bible.

We have, then, a plain argument. *Uniformity, efficiency, and adaptation* of means to ends, are the proofs in Nature of Divine origin. But the Bible has the same proofs, and must, therefore,

be attributed to the same cause. It is upon these fixed principles of Nature that the hopes of the husbandman, the success of commerce, the triumphs and perpetuity of inventions, discoveries, and the whole utilitarian progress of mankind depend. A change in any one of these great natural causes would overthrow the whole. Instability in the operation of cause and effect would stop the plowman in the furrow, the fleets of commerce in mid-ocean, or tie them up to rot upon the shores of the world. The discoveries and inventions of to-day would be worthless upon to-morrow; all motives depending upon the permanence of the laws of Nature would pass away, and the world would either come to ruin or to a dead stand-still. The colors would fail on the brush of the painter, and the needle, in the nightly tempest, would no longer prove faithful to its trust. The printer could no longer depend upon his liquid die to impart the usual impression to his page. Food, and air, and water, and light, would fail in their reviving qualities, and possibly turn to pains or poisons. The steam-horse, that now proudly dashes past all competitors, would be heard no more. The telegraph, that greatest and most wonderful of all monuments to human sagacity, would pass away as the memory of a dream. How little do men think of what and how much they owe to the stability of the laws of Nature!

The permanence of these not only leans to, and assists the great inventions of the world, but it secures the perpetuity of all the gains of the arts, sciences, discoveries, inventions, and philosophies of all ages. No good can be lost which is based upon the changeless decree of natural law. This is the method in which God speaks to man through His works.

Another well known law in Nature is, that similar causes produce similar effects, physical causes produce physical effects, and intellectual causes produce intellectual effects, and moral causes produce moral effects; and all these have their special and well defined boundaries. Hence the deep philosophy of the question, "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Hence, also, "the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin." And upon the same inexorable law, water-baptism can not take away sin, the cause and the effect being totally dissimilar. The cause being physical and the effect being spiritual, it is impossible to be in the nature of things. It is reversing the laws of Nature, contradicting the testimony of Scripture and of facts,

when men make water-baptism either a direct cause, or an essential and invariable accompaniment of regeneration.

The dream called "Apostolical Succession," is of the same nature. Unflawed succession, if it could be proved, does not stand in the relation of cause and effect to the Church of God. Christ himself stands in that relation, and just as he is in the Church, and is head over all things to it; so is it a true Church, whether it is Presbyterian, Episcopal, or what not.

The Universe around us is a great system of laws, causes and effects, adapted to our material nature; while the Bible is a great system of laws, causes and effects, adapted to our spiritual nature. And we here claim that, in the proof of Divine authorship, the material works of God have no superiority over the Bible. The one is not more nor better adapted to our material nature, than the other is to our moral nature; that the laws of the material world are not more permanent, more efficient, or better adapted to their object, than the laws and spirit of the Bible are to their object. And as a great moral cause, producing great moral effects, the soul can no more dispense with the Bible, than the body can with the solid world.

But let us look into some of the effects of which the Bible is the cause. And as we pass along we will see whether, in its operations, it is uniform, efficient, and adapted to its professed object. And first, it is the only book or thing in the world that imparts a correct and adequate knowledge of God's moral and natural attributes. The Bible is full of this grand necessity. It is just such a revelation as none but God himself could give. The names, the attributes, the descriptions, the character, are all such as to prove their Divine origin. Even the nightly heavens scarcely declare the glory of God so fully as does the sublime and majestic language of the Bible. Nor does the Divine Word deal with us in terms of sublimity and grandeur alone; nor does it leave us to stagger and tremble amid the heights and depths of immensity. This light illuminates our way where no other light could reach us. It gives clearness and safety to our path into the presence of unoriginated existence. But from that light, whose terrors, veiled and un veiled, stand in terrible numbers and nearness to the soul, we are borne along in the mighty sweep which brings us to where God and man unite in the glories, and wonders, and reconciling harmonies of redemption. On this great central spot of Grace the

soul stops in its flight from the regions of the dark, the mysterious, and the terrible, to survey the distant but hastening light of the Sun of Righteousness. And how glorious is that light as it rises from the eastern skies upon the soul! How sweet and how enrapturing are the words, "God is Love;" "Peace on earth and good will to men;" "Our Father who art in Heaven;" "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!" Life and joy leap out from every word of these Divine sentences. Alarm and terror take their flight from their presence. Faith sets up its throne within the heart, and hope spreads its light on every hand. God, as the object of supreme love, spreads His unutterable glories every-where.

It has been remarked, with truth and point, that while the ancient Jews were greatly inferior to the ancient Greeks in things literary, philosophical, and architectural; yet, as to the knowledge of God, and all things theological and moral, the Jews were, beyond all comparison, superior to the Greeks. As to the temples made with hands, and other architectural prodigies, the Egyptians and Greeks have astonished all succeeding ages.

The poetry, the history, the oratory, the criticism, the mathematics and philosophy of the subtle and inquisitive Greeks have been the study and admiration of all the great scholars of the world down to the present times. Yet this people had their Lords and their Gods many. By wisdom they knew not God. And in all theological matters they were scarcely above the common herd of idolators. They stand out among the gloomy wastes of idolatrous superstition, and as an amazing monument to the necessity of Divine revelation. They testify, beyond all doubt, that the natural man knoweth not the things of the spirit; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. If any polish or attainments in scholarship; if any elegance or refinements in taste; if any superiority in arts, oratory, or statesmanship; if depth and acuteness in thought; if splendor and power of genius, and if works of the highest eminence in literature could have morally enlightened and regenerated any people, then the Greeks, beyond any and all other nations, would have proved it. If ever there were a people capable of throwing off the thick masses of superstitious lumber, and of tossing idolatry to the moles and the bats, that people was the ancient Greeks. And here we see in the light of one of the clearest demonstrations, that all men mor-

ally drivel like idiots where God's Word does not enlighten them. And the character and condition of all men, in all time, without Divine Revelation, put to scorn and confusion the idea, that without it, any high or general moral excellence can be reached. And let those who dream the dull and idiotic dream, that learning and intelligence are to regenerate the world, look at what amount of regeneration was accomplished by Greece. Let them look at the difference, theologically and religiously, between David and Socrates—the former born near eleven centuries before Christ, and the latter not five. The Hebrew King and Prophet soars amid the upper clouds, and in the light of great and Divine knowledge, while the great Grecian Teacher and Philosopher is seen buffeting the stormy waves of doubt, perplexity and fear. And yet Socrates was the greatest and the best of all the pupils ever made by uninspired thought and intelligence. And what the bright and keen dialectics of Greece could not do, we are very sure, is not going to be done by the pretentious Naturalists and sham Philosophers of modern times. Nothing short of Divine Revelation can teach us our duties, and nothing short of this can supply us with motives of sufficient power and authority to do them.

Ignorance of God lies at the foundation of all moral errors. And just as the Bible shines into the understanding, so does it dissipate moral falsehood, and purify, enlighten, and benefit the soul in every way. What a magnificent specimen of a man would Socrates have been, had it been his lot to live under the shining light of Divine Truth! The noblest man upon earth is the man whose soul is all aglow with the fire, and all luminous with the light of the Divine Word. Such a man, however humble, is as much superior, in all things of God, and in all things of duty to Him, as the temple of Diana was superior to a mud-hovel. Man, without that knowledge, which is found alone in its fullness in the Bible, is, at his best earthly state, but a wanderer in a weary waste, homeless and hopeless, ever seeking rest and finding none.

THE BIBLE ALONE CAN IMPART TO MAN THE TRUE KNOWLEDGE OF
HIMSELF.

For such knowledge, it is in vain that we look to any other source. Without the Bible, even the origin of our race is lost amid the dim confusion and absurd traditions of the world. When we want a clear and rational account of our own origin, we have

to go to the Bible. The picture, too, which it gives us of our moral nature, is just such a one as God alone could draw. It is true to perfection, to every tint, and shade, and feature, and variation, of the whole moral character of man. Nor does it thus describe human nature in any one time, place, tribe, nation, class, or progeny. It is not the human nature of the Jew or the Greek; of nations, ancient or modern; of classes, barbarous or civilized; of people, learned or ignorant; but it is the exact moral picture of man, individually and collectively, of all times, places, and circumstances. The picture is without exaggeration, and without defect. It has all the mastery of infinite capacity, and all the exactness of infinite knowledge. And among all the efforts to alter, to amend, to vary, or to deny it, not one of them all has produced any thing but falsehood and distortion. And that paltry philosophy, and still more paltry theology, which set up their verdicts against the Word of God, find themselves refuted and overthrown by the universal character of man. Confident and defamatory arrogance may deal in dogmas flattering to the human heart, but it does not remove the tempest to deny its existence.

Men do not like the picture which the Bible draws with such extreme exactness, and therefore they try to disbelieve it, pervert it, or substitute something better in its place. But in all such cases they prove the picture in their efforts to escape it. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. Without this knowledge, man will never know himself.

ANOTHER EFFECT OF THE BIBLE IS THE REVEALING OF THE GREAT
AND ESSENTIAL DOCTRINES OF THE CROSS.

These doctrines are, through the Spirit, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. They are doctrines of life, light, and immortality. They are to the honor of God and the hope of the world. Their true value and glory are beyond all estimate and measure. Beside their direct effect upon the number saved, they are the direct expression of the moral government of God. Justice and mercy are here harmoniously blended. Salvation comes through propitiation, and we can equally adore Divine justice as we rejoice in Divine mercy. Christ's bearing our sins in his own body upon the tree, is the great publication to heaven

and earth of God's method of saving sinners. He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities. He, who knew no sin, was made a sin-offering for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. This shows the substitutionary nature of Christ's sacrifice. It points to moral government, and refers directly to law and justification by the deeds of another. There can be no dilution of these ideas, and no concessions to any thing which would disturb the foundations of their strength. Redemption through Christ is a great cause to great effects, and all systems of faith, bereft of an Almighty Saviour, may deceive, but can not save.

When men talk about a metaphorical Saviour, they talk about a metaphorical salvation, which is the last and the most fatal of all shams. If we want to find truth, which God will bless, and make mighty to the pulling down of strongholds and to the overthrowing of all spiritual enemies, we must go to the doctrines concerning Christ and Him crucified. It is here, and here only, that we find means adapted to the end, and adequate to the effect.

Men may talk as they please, or as they dream, about viewing God through goodness and mercy. We know nothing of goodness and mercy separated from justice; but it is in Christ that we find all these attributes beautifully and gloriously harmonized. Justice itself is but a particular form of goodness, and can not be set aside nor neglected without inflicting dishonor on every other attribute of God. And no system, denying the divinity of Christ and His vicarious atonement, has ever done much for the true spiritual interests of men. And, as illustrative of this, we may look at a couple of representative men of the two systems. Take Chalmers and Channing as samples: They were men of the same period, and molded by many similar influences. They were grand specimens of men, and fair examples of the effects of two opposite creeds, working in these two sons of Anak.

The elements of power, which these men brought into the great battle-field of ministerial toil and conflict, were such as belonged to the faith of each. Channing was full of the arguings, contrivings, and pride of human reason. He was ardent, eloquent, and earnest. He had a classic mind, and delighted in classic tastes and attainments. He was not charmed with the elegancies of literary learning, but loved certain forms of moral beauty—that, however, of Socrates more than that of Paul. With the great workers on the

fields of orthodoxy he had but little sympathy. Human virtue, without the life of Christ within it, was his *beau idéal* and highest form of his divinity. His judgment endowed her with a power which she never had, and his imagination clothed her with charms beautifully and mildly gorgeous, but not true. He was himself a splendid specimen of his own ideas of ministerial equipment. With a mind cultivated with elegant literature, enlarged by general reading and observation, though more given to *belles-lettres* than logic, strong in the confidence of moral suasion, and with a knowledge of human nature utterly false and superficial, he marched into the field of conflict with high hopes and confident bearing. Admiration followed every-where, and blew the blast of his fame even to foreign lands. The *élite* of Boston set him high among the notabilities of her eloquent and literary renown. He had "audience meet" to inspire and call out all those tastes, passions and powers upon which he so confidently relied, and which he cultivated with such assiduous diligence. To these he looked as the arms of his strength, and as the security of his success. But after all his love and practice of the esthetic, after all the literary and oratorical garniture with which he arrayed himself before the people, he left behind him no long and broad track of light to distinguish the period of his life and deeds. The success of the outset and continuance were wholly unequal to the confidence and expectation of events. Light and victory were to follow in his path. The great old temples of error were to be heard crashing and falling from afar. It was the day of Unitarian glory, and the shout of triumph was never again to cease until the hosts of orthodoxy fell or fled before the irresistible march of its power. But, alas! the world—even the world of Boston, the Athens of America—moved on as usual. Even the admirers of Channing remained as if he had never lived.

If ever Unitarianism had a fair field of trial, and if it ever had a fair representative to train its legions, and to direct its forces, it was when William Ellery Channing marshaled its hosts, fought its battles, bore its banners, and represented its power. But what was the result of his life and labors as the great representative of a system, and the great preacher of that creed? Let history tell the meager tale, as it is destined to tell it in all similar instances. All spiritual life and power evaporate from every system of faith

which destroys the divine and wonderful in the nature and character of Christ.

It is no pleasure to say these things, except as historical facts, exhibiting the innate poverty and insufficiency of Unitarianism. Such facts are truly instructive in their nature. There is scarcely any thing more to be deplored, or any thing more to be pitied, than a man like Channing—sincere, but deluded—to find himself, after all his high hopes and purposes, in old age, “worn out with a laborious doing of nothing.” To find, after the vigor of life has sped away, that all that was ardent in hope, confident in purpose, and alluring in promise, had utterly failed; to find that all the charms of rhetoric, the treasures of learning, the appeals of eloquence, and the arguments of reason, have no power to regenerate human souls, nor even to reform the morals of the world, presents a spectacle of melancholy and humiliation, over which the good man would rather weep than rejoice, if it were right to do so. Yet it is well that a deadly system should betray its weakness and its worthlessness just in such hands. It is well that such a man as Channing should stand as a beacon upon the bleak and barren shores of error. We have pity for the man, but no sympathy with his creed. His views of God and man were alike defective and fatal. Hence the remedy did not reach the disease, nor was the physician competent to the work he had undertaken. His arms and methods of attack were wholly unfitted to an enemy, whose number and whose power he never understood. They were wrought and polished in the armories of human device. They lacked the celestial temper, which alone makes them mighty to the pulling down of strongholds. The enemy himself was delighted with their form, their elegance, and symmetry, and with the dextrous skill with which they were handled, but laughed at the harmless force with which they struck the great citadels of his power.

But, on the other hand, Thomas Chalmers stands out a conspicuous example of an opposite creed. He was, for twelve years of his life, a mere man of Science and literature, though a professed minister of the Word. He was, in this sense, still more Channing than Channing himself. He was proud, learned, philosophical, ambitious, and defiant of those who stood in his way. Like Channing, he preached literature, reason, morals, philosophy, honor, and any thing but Christ. But it pleased God to wake him

from the delirium of so wild and fatal a dream. He had been proud of his abilities, and of his attainments, and was thoroughly pharisaic, as all such men ever are. But now he was prostrate in humility, and, like all other penitent sinners, his guilt rose dark and fearful before him. But the Divine method of justification soon began to shine upon his soul. And just as it did so, he put on the whole armor of God and went into the battle-field with a new, and strange, and mighty power working within him. He was now a new man. Old things had passed away, and all things had become new. Christ was now the great central figure in the field of his thought, of his exposition, and of the new and wonderful power which he had now gained over the hearts of men. He was no longer to Chalmers a root out of dry ground, but the chief among ten thousand, and one altogether lovely.

His hearers began to wonder what change had come over the spirit of the man. He had been ardent in preaching against "the meanness of dishonesty, the villainy of falsehood, the despicable arts of calumny, and upon all those deformities of character which awaken the natural indignation of the human heart against the pests and disturbers of human society. But the interesting fact is, that during the whole of that period—upward of twelve years—in which I made no attempt against the natural enmity of the human mind to God, while I was inattentive to the way in which this enmity is dissolved, even by the free offer on the one hand, and the believing acceptance on the other, of the gospel of salvation; which Christ, through whose blood the sinner, who by nature stands afar off, is brought near to the Heavenly Law-giver, whom he has offended, was scarcely ever spoken of, or spoken of in such a way as stripped him of the importance of his character and offices; even at this time I certainly did press reformation of honor, and truth and integrity, among my people, but I never once heard of such reformation having been effected among them. I am not sensible that all the vehemence with which I urged the virtues and proprieties of social life, had *the weight of a feather on the moral habits of my parishioners.*" Such is the honest, but melancholy testimony which Chalmers gives of the first twelve years of his ministry. As to the great end of the Christian ministry, it was a failure, complete and total. And what these twelve years were to him, the whole of the life of Channing was to him. Rhetoric, and literature, and oratory, and eloquent and vehement denun-

ciation of the sins of social life, made the sum total of their armor, and resulted in the entire failure of their efforts. The one found it out in time, the other did not.

We attribute much to the natural greatness of Chalmers; his almost unequalled eloquence; his enlightened and statesmanlike mind; his broad philosophy and learning; his wise adaptation of means to ends; his great physical ability, producing the thunder of his power; his capacity to influence and deal with all orders of mind; his simplicity of life, transparent honesty and candor of purpose, all go to constitute a character of the highest order and most admirable proportions. But, magnificent as this galaxy of qualities and attainments is, yet they never produced *the weight of a feather* in reforming any single human heart, until they were regenerated with the heart of their great owner. Until that great event, they had been frittered away and lost upon empty vanities. But now he became great and powerful, in a new sense, under the operation of a new and living faith. The heart now felt what the intellect believed. It was this which enlightened and animated the whole of his great and well trained power. He no longer wielded the sword of the natural man, but the sword of the Spirit. The very highest honors which he had courted before, now became, as other worldly things became, baubles in comparison with the new and lofty things which had begun to shed their glory upon all things within him and without him. He now began a race of ever-during honor and of the most gigantic usefulness.

He made an era of the times in which he lived. He left upon his country the stamp of his wisdom, his eloquence, his intellect, his energy, his ecclesiastical statesmanship, and supreme fidelity to the greatest and noblest trusts that God at any time allots to mortals. He was strong, but it was the Cross of Christ which made him so. He was genial and world-wide in his sympathies with man, but he was genial and world-wide as Christ was, and not as the teachers of false doctrines, who cover over, but bring no remedy for deep moral diseases of man. His doctrine was Christ Divine and Christ Human. Man lost and man recovered by an adequate and God-honoring remedy. Had there been no depravity in man, and no divinity in Christ, there had been, not only no Chalmers, but none of that long list of magnificent men, whose names shine out like luminaries along the whole track of Church history. It was the utter renunciation of all self-righteous-

ness and all self-salvation, and an entire reception of salvation through the grace of Christ the Redeemer, that saved Chalmers from the dreary lot of a mere worldly preacher.

Like Channing, he might have studied literature, taste, elegance, history, science, or philosophy; he might have written books, essays, and reviews, and won such renown as such things give, but as a minister of the Divine Word, his life would have been the merest blank. The memories and admiration which now hang around him in rich festoons of glory, would never have had an existence. Men live and rejoice in leaguening themselves with the great living powers of Truth and Righteousness; and men die by leaguening themselves with the feeble inanities and frigidities of false and superficial errors, however specious they may be. Doctrines, wholly unfitted to the nature of man, may flash like meteors for the night, but must die when the morning cometh.

Had the heart of Channing been warmed by the same heat, and his soul lit up by the same light, we can not think the results of their lives would have presented so great and so unhappy a contrast. The one might not have had the opportunity of leaving the stamp of his ecclesiastical statesmanship upon his church and country, and though not equal in power and depth, yet he might have trodden closely upon the heels of his great Scotch brother.

We know, indeed, that it is far more to the liking of his ecclesiastical kith and kin, that Channing should stand just where he does. But time, and eternity, and the nature of man will yet proclaim it, that mere ambitious learning, worldly fame, and errors which overturn the whole nature of the gospel, are but poor compensations in a dying day for those high achievements which distinguish the life and evangelical ministry.

We have not one word to say in slight of any amount or variety of learning which ministerial preparation and constant industry may bring into the field of its contests and conquests. The more of learning, and of the high equipments which constitute the workman that needeth not to be ashamed, the better and more important it is for the cause of Truth and Righteousness. Orthodox Christianity has never shrunk from any of those great conflicts requiring the profoundest learning and rarest attainments. Sound learning is our admiration and our *sine qua non* in the ministry. It is one of the ends and aims of our Church. Nor do we yield for a

moment-to those supercilious claims of superiority in learning so arrogantly put forth about Boston.

But we regard every thing as an impertinence and an offense, which comes in as a succedaneum for the doctrines of the Cross. We have no taste and no approbation for any sermon, or pulpit exhibition, however eloquently grand, or elegantly tasteful it may be, when it does not shine in the Light of Heaven, and when its fires do not glow with the heat of Divine Truth. We have a liking for essays and elegant dissertations in the *Rambler* and *Spectator*; but in the pulpit, the proper tone and drift are far more Heaven-ward and Christ-like than these. A sermon is always a profane affair to us when its literature is manifestly the chief material in its structure. The whole thing lacks fitness, and is a most conspicuous manifestation of the worst of all unfitness.

Yet, Knowledge and Preaching are twin sisters. The pulpit, without learning, is ignorance attempting to teach mankind. There is no spot on earth where regenerated and sanctified learning shines with such splendor, and works with such Divine efficiency, as in the pulpit. But, like the sun, it shines without effort and without display.

We have noticed that, about Boston, where Unitarianism most abounds, its ministers, to a great extent, become literary compilers, historians, essayists, reviewers, poets, etc., as a business. Now, we think this the most natural thing in the world; nor do we blame these men for this change of occupation. The cultivated mind looks for variety, and must have it. But where it has eviscerated its own profession of all that boundless wealth and endless variety of living knowledge and ideas, which every-where shine out from an unspoiled gospel, it is a matter altogether to be expected that it would seek other fields, however poor, on which to expend its power, create its renown, and gratify its reachings after variety. To preach, for perpetuity, a Christless gospel, is a desert of sand with the simoom of monotony ever blowing across it.

It is, therefore, no wonder that men, whose creed lacks variety, vastness, and Divine mystery, should seek other scenes of intellectual exertion. We can scarcely conceive of a life more joyless than his, who having to preach, has often gone the round of all the variety which his system affords. To assign such a task to an honest and able man, is to expose him to manifold causes of uneasiness. And after having tried to impart variety and vitality to

a system which will not sustain either, if he should turn Congressman, Historian or any thing else to relieve his tedium, who can blame him? Another relief, and not so innocent, is preaching to the times.

Thus the Bible, either absolutely rejected, or its great fundamental doctrines torn up by the roots, fails, as a great instrumental cause, to accomplish its great, its wonderful and salutary effects upon the souls of men.

Another thing may here be remarked: No system, denying the Divinity of Christ, has ever yet reared up or sustained a great religious reformer. Had there been no Divinity in Christ, there had been no Paul, no Peter, no Luther, no Calvin. The Divinity of Christ, as an article of Christian faith, has been the great vitalizing principle in every reformer and in every reformation since the days of the crucifixion. There are no motives of sufficient power, in any system, which denies the depravity of man and the Divinity of Christ, to originate and sustain a reformer.

When Wesley and Whitfield began their reforming labors in England, the pulpits of the country had ceased to resound with the name of Christ as the life and only hope of sinners. Wintry essays and polished frost-work constituted most of the pulpit pabulum of the land. But when these great trumpeters blew their blasts, they did it, not in the name of a man, but in the name of Immanuel, God with us. And just as all reformers have done this, so has the gospel in their hands become quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword—like a fire and a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces. And as none has yet been, so no reformation will ever be found springing up from the dead embers of a Christless gospel.

ART. III.—*The Meaning and Use of סֵלָה (Selah.)*

MUCH has been written in the attempt to show what may have been the meaning and use of סֵלָה, Selah, (which occurs both in the Psalms and in the song of Habakkuk,) but the result thus far seems to be unsatisfactory. We can not think, however, that this

should be suffered to induce us to abandon the hope of ultimately ascertaining the intention of the Holy Spirit in the employment of the term. And it is preferable still to wait in the attitude of patient inquiry, and of hope, rather than to identify our position with that of too many interpreters of the Scriptures, and with not a few who conduct the worship of God in our churches: for the Latin vulgate and Spanish version have excluded the word entirely; while some preachers of the Gospel have the presumption to omit it in their public reading of those portions of the Bible in connection with which it is employed. The plea offered in the attempt to justify this procedure, that the meaning of the term is not certainly known, if admitted to be valid, will be found fairly entitled to an application much more extensive; since, on this ground, not only must *Selah* be excluded from the use of the Sanctuary, but, along with it, any and every term, phrase, or portion of the Divine Word, the meaning of which is uncertain in the preacher's estimation; not excepting those "things hard to be understood" to which Peter refers as existing in the epistles of Paul. Surely we are not prepared to concede to any man the prerogative to take such liberties with that inspired word which God has *magnified above all his name*; Ps. cxxxviii: 2. And to any who may be inclined to assume it, we commend the remark of the late Dr. Alexander, in his exposition of Ps. iii: 3, in which, referring to *Selah*, he says: "Like the titles, it invariably forms part of the text, and its omission by some Editors and Translators is a mutilation of the Word of God."

We propose to offer a few remarks in relation to the term itself, after which we shall present briefly the view we have for many years entertained respecting it; and shall, also, explain the use which we have been led to make of it in the perusal of those precious portions of the Sacred Volume in which it occurs.

The word is employed *seventy-one* times in the Psalms, and *three* times in the Song of Habakkuk, (Hab. iii: 3, 9, 13.) Dr. Alexander on Ps. iii: 3, and likewise Gesenius, *sub voce*, say that it occurs *seventy-three* times in the Psalms, which is a mistake.*

* For the information of some of our readers, it may be proper to remark that a similar term elsewhere occurring (as in 2 Kings, xiv: 7, and Isa. xvi: 1), although the same English letters are employed in transferring it, is a different word in the Hebrew, (שָׁלוֹם;) and is in other places translated *rock*. See for example Judges i: 36, and Ps. xviii: 2, (3,) and xlii: 9, (10.)

It occurs in some Psalms but *once*:* Ps. vii: 5, and xx: 3, and xxi: 2. In others it occurs *twice*: Ps. iv: 2, 4, and ix: 16, 20. In others, *thrice*: Ps. iii: 2, 4, 8, and xxxii: 4, 5, 7, and lxxv: 4, 7, 15, and lxxviii: 7, 19, 32; and in one instance *four* times: Ps. lxxxix: 4, 37, 45, 48, while sometimes it occurs in the middle of a verse, as in Ps. lv: 19, and lvii: 3, and Hab. iii: 3, 9; and at other times at the end of a Psalm: Ps. iii, ix and xxiv. Thus, it may serve to divide a Psalm into several strophes. And that, in a certain sense, it is a *sign of pause*, appears to be evident from the fact that the LXX every-where render it by *διαφαίμα*. The term is from *διαφάλλω*; and is defined by Suidas to be a *change either of song or metre*. But that it refers merely to the instrumental music, and not to the vocal performance, is as groundless an assumption as it would be to maintain the same in relation to *da capo* itself, in instances where both the vocal and instrumental are united. Gesenius strongly maintains that it merely indicates a pause; and even renders *Higgaion, Selah*, (Ps. ix: 17), "*instrumental music, pause*;" that is, let the instruments strike up a symphony, and the singer pause." But this is mere assumption. Dr. Alexander's view is every way preferable, though we do not conceive that even he has presented the full meaning of the expression. We shall have occasion to advert to this again.

That סֵלָה is not an abbreviation, has been argued upon the assumed ground that such abbreviations were unknown to the ancient Jews. But, really, the assumption seems to stand as much in need of proof as the hypothesis which is founded upon it. The abbreviations in the margin of the Hebrew Bible are confessedly of high antiquity. And, although it has been repeated with great positiveness and assurance that there are none in the text itself, it is from the text itself that we should be led to suppose that the Jews excelled in the art of abbreviation. The Acrostic Psalms evince how art was combined with the majestic simplicity of these early compositions. And it would not require a very great stretch of the imagination to suppose that the initial letters in those Psalms may have stood, in the estimation of the Jews, as the representatives, in that connection, of the verse, clause or word at the

* These references are to the enumeration of the verses as given in the English version.

commencement of which they stand; and that they may have, for example, spoken of the "*Daleth clause*" of Ps. cxii; the "*Beth verse*" of Ps. xxxiv; or of the "*Lamedh section*" of Ps. cxix. For we find the letters of the Alphabet (with a slight variation or two,) commencing *seriatim* the verses of Psalms xxv, xxxiv, and cxlv; and in Psalm cxix each letter commencing eight verses consecutively, while in Ps. xxxvii those letters commence the alternate verses; and then, still further, and still more remarkable for its artistic beauty, we find in Psalms cxi and cxii those letters commencing *seriatim* each clause of the Psalm.*

But, omitting further remark on this point, what are the suffixes and many of the prefixes of the verbs, nouns, etc., if not instances of abbreviation? And so, too, the Vav conversive, the Apocopation of the future in Lamedh He verbs, and the He Paragogic, and many others of the phenomena of the language? We find these phenomena in connection with an abundantly sufficient variation of usage to show that in the time when any of the specific examples which may be referred to occurred, the language—whatever may have been its original condition at and after the confusion of tongues—was still in the process of moulding and formation.

But while we guard against a too extensive range in the argument, let us descend to a few particulars. In respect to the suffixes, for example, we find that כִּי and י. are abbreviated representations of אֲנֹכִי and אֲנִי; and נוּ for אֲנִיחֵנוּ, etc.; and amongst the prefixes שׁ for אֲשֶׁר; as in שֶׁכֶּךָ and בְּשִׁיפֹל, and the like. Nor would it avail any thing to plead that these instances occur in combination with other words; the objection would amount to nothing if even they were affixes instead of suffixes, etc.; for the fact is not thereby in any way affected, that they are really and truly abbreviations of the words they represent. And so, too, in respect to instances like the following: פִּלְמְנִי is confessedly an abbreviation of the words אֶלְמְנִי and פִּלְנִי; while, according to the celebrated Rabbi, Jonah, עֲשֵׂתִי (the alternate of עָזַר in Number Eleven,) is abbreviated from עָרַשְׁתִּי. Such abbreviations confessedly exist, and it were easy to add to the number, if either the Hebrew Bible, or only a Lexicon, were accessible. †

* Compare also Prov. xxxi: 10-31, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

† The recent military restrictions, in regard to the baggage of officers in the army, have rendered it necessary to throw aside nearly all of the very few books which I had been able to carry on the march.

And yet we are gravely informed that the ancient Jews knew nothing of the art of abbreviation, and that no such forms exist in the Hebrew text!

The Apocopation of the Future in Lamedh He verbs would certainly seem to indicate that the idea was a very obvious and familiar one to the Hebrew mind; while the He Paragogic, representing, as it often does in the Imperative, entreaty and strong desire, conveys an idea not in any way apparent in the isolated letter itself. Nor is it thus added for the purpose of either softening or facilitating the pronunciation, as every Grammarian must admit, but simply to express earnest desire, etc. Whether it be in this connection like ך Conversive, an abbreviation, may be denied; but what would the denial amount to? And that the best Grammarians regard ך as an abbreviation, will not be questioned.* By some it is affirmed to be an abbreviation of ךָ; by others, of ךָּ; and Ewald, the greatest of all Grammarians, regards it as an abbreviation of ךָּ. But, however they may differ as to the word which it represents, they unite in regarding it as an abbreviation. And to deny a knowledge of the art and uses of abbreviation to a people possessing such evidences of refinement and advancement in literature as existed in the days of David and Solomon, seems to us like the very frivolity of capricious criticism.

Why, then, should not the ancient Jews have been familiar with this art? We find it prevail, and to a remarkable extent, in every age of Rabbinical literature. And on what ground is its origin to be attributed to the more modern Rabbins, instead of their ancestors? This might be allowable, were the art referred to one which was more likely to be developed in an advanced stage, or in the decline of literature, rather than in its earlier stages. But such is not the fact—the reverse being the invariable rule. The assumption, however, is of no account, and can make nothing against so regarding the term, provided it can be most satisfactorily understood, and its use explained on that hypothesis. No etymology of the word that has yet been suggested is regarded

* This is admitted by Professor Green, of Princeton, in his admirably arranged and exhaustive Grammar of the Hebrew Language; though his views are adverse to our own on the main issue presented in this article, yet he supposes that the article ך is an abbreviation of ךָ, § 229.

either as satisfactory, or susceptible of being thoroughly sustained; a fact which may find its true solution in the other fact that no etymology can explain it as a single term. The Arabians, moreover, and other ancient nations, have always been familiar with the form of abbreviation which this word, if regarded as such, would represent. And why, then, and on what rational ground, must a similar knowledge be denied the ancient Jews? But, without here entering into the dispute respecting the employment of abbreviations by the Jews, we shall assume that סֵלָה is an abbreviation analogous to that which, indisputably, has been for many ages, and ever since the commencement of their Rabbinic literature, common with that people; and, at a far earlier period, with the Arabians, as, for example, in the well known instance, Rashi (רש"י) for *Rabbi Solomon Iarchi*, (רַבִּי שְׁלֹמֹה יָרְחִי.) In like manner סֵלָה may stand for לִמְעֵלָה הַשֵּׁנִי; *Return back again*, (or to the beginning) *O Singer*. And if such a hypothesis will suffice to explain and illustrate satisfactorily its use, the assumption that it is an abbreviation will hardly be regarded as without reason.

The LXX, who have given the earliest representation of the word which exists in any other language, seem to have entertained an idea similar to this as to its meaning. For as they could neither transfer the abbreviation as such into the Greek language so as to be intelligible to the nations; nor, with any better success, form an equivalent abbreviation in that language, their resort seems to have been to give, as briefly as possible, the meaning of the clause which the word itself represents. Hence, as above remarked, they substitute in lieu of it διαψαλμα, importing a change in the performance. The word *chorus*, as then used, could not have expressed the idea intended; nor have designated the part to be repeated; and was, therefore, not employed. All this was, however, perfectly familiar to them and to all the Jews. And this very familiarity seemed to render in their view a full explanation unnecessary, even in translating the Bible. And thus, when the public service of the temple was abolished, the meaning of the word, and even of διαψαλμα, as thus technically applied, and not designating the exact change itself, seems to have faded from the memory of all—so much so, that by the time of Jerome all vestige of its true meaning was lost, as appears from the fact that he wholly omits to refer to it in his version. The Talmud pro-

poses to explain it by substituting *לעלם* in *aeternum*. But this is sheer nonsense, as any one can see by attempting at any extent to verify the substitution. And this fact, taken in connection with the utter omission of the word by Jerome in the vulgate, would seem very plainly to intimate that soon after the destruction of the Jewish Temple and nationality, its meaning was lost among both Jews and Christians.

The Psalms in which *Selah* occurs are thirty-nine in number,* (or forty, if we may reckon the Song of Habakkuk,) to-wit: 3, 4, 7, 9, 20, 21, 24, 32, 39, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67, 68, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 140, 143. And, according to the old Jewish division of the Psalter, (to which we here advert as a matter of convenience for future reference,) it is employed as follows:

In Book I., including Psalms 1-41, it is used seventeen times.

"	II.,	"	"	42-72, it is used thirty times.
"	III.,	"	"	73-89, it is used twenty times.
"	IV.,	"	"	90-106, not at all.
"	V.,	"	"	107-150, it is used four times. †

* It is not found in the *Acrostic Psalms*, (25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, and 145,) nor in the *Songs of Degrees*, (Ps. 120-134;) nor in any of the *Psalms without titles*, of which there are 35. It has been said to be peculiar to the Psalms entitled *תהלה*. There is not much in this, however. There are 56 Psalms so entitled, of which but 26 contain *Selah*; and it exists in 13 Psalms with other titles. It is found in 7 of the 13 entitled *תהלה*; and in 3 of the 6 entitled *תהלה*, and is, therefore, as peculiar to these as to those inscribed *תהלה*. In Ps. lxxxviii, two of these titles are united. The remaining four, (containing *Selah*), to which none of these titles belong, are Ps. vii, xli, lxi, and lxxi. In these and all other references which I make to the Psalter in this essay, I use the edition issued by Bagster. It seems to be accurate and reliable, but I have no opportunity to compare it with any other edition of the Hebrew Text.

† The origin of this partition of the book is confessedly so ancient that it can not now be traced. It is still retained by the Jews, who believe that it is part of the original arrangement of the book as made by Divine authority; and who profess to derive some of their reasons for this conclusion from the book itself. They note that each of the first three books ends in *אמן*, and the fourth in *אמן חללוהו*, neither of which terminations is found elsewhere in the Psalms. The ending of Book V., as that book completes the Psalter, needed no specific designation; hence it is not marked by any peculiarity, and is the same with that of several other Psalms.

The Psalms were originally prepared for the public service of the Tabernacle and Temple, as is plainly apparent from the titles given to many of them.* Ezra probably completed the arrangement of the book in its present form. And it is obvious that no attempt has been made to arrange them in chronological order, or in the order of their production, whatever other principle may have been the rule of that arrangement. It seems highly probable, moreover, that all the Psalms were employed in that service; and that each had its appropriate place assigned to it (and which may have been originally designated by the Holy Spirit when He supplied the Psalm,) in the course of those public observances which were appointed for the Jewish worshipers during the year. The frequent occurrence of *Selah* in those sacred lyrics would seem, therefore, unquestionably to intimate that it had some essential relation to the proper performance of that service; and it seems very unlikely that this relation to the true and spiritual worship of Almighty God should be of such a nature as to depend upon the mere instrumental accompaniment of that service, and to be confined exclusively to the Jewish worshiper and public worship, seeing that the Psalms, like the rest of the Scriptures, were designed not for Jews only, but for all, of every age and nation, who worship God in spirit and in truth; and to all of whom those delightful compositions have ever been truly dear—for the term *Selah*, unlike the title of the Psalm, which is but an external designation, enters into its very construction, (sometimes occurring even in the middle of a verse or sentence,) and is part of the body of it, and must have related essentially to the use to which it was put by the worshipers themselves. It can hardly, therefore, with any sufficient degree of probability, be supposed to relate merely to the external performance—and to the instrumental part alone of that performance—but must, like the rest of the Psalm, relate also to the devotional exercises of all the worshipers; and be susceptible of being, in like manner, employed, in aiding such devotion, even in social and private worship, and in the absence of musical accompaniment. If this be so, and it certainly seems not unlikely, then the theory that it is merely a musical note, or a notation, for directing the instrumental part of the performance, is untenable.

* מנצח (to the chief musician,) is employed in the titles of fifty-three Psalms. See also Isa. xxxviii: 20.

Nor can the mind rest with any more satisfaction, (as we shall see,) in the supposition that it is intended merely to announce a pause in the performance itself.

In considering these things, we have long been led to regard the word as much more significant than these or any similar theories would seem to require, and to look still further for the solution of the question as to its meaning and use. It certainly may be supposed to have reference as much to the Christian worshiper, as to the ancient Jewish believer, (unless we would fall in with the preposterous notion of Semler, respecting "the local and temporary" character of certain portions of the Word of God *); and it seems to us that no solution of the question as to its meaning and use should be regarded as satisfactory, which does not take this into the account. And, as no really substantial reason has stood in the way of our doing so, we have been led, therefore, to look for the solution on the basis before adverted to—that *the word is an abbreviation*; and that like the D. C. of *da capo* (and not unlike these words in their meaning,) it is designed to direct the worshiper, whether standing with the choir or in "the great congregation," to *return again to some part of the Psalm which had been already performed*. So, as already stated, we have for many years employed it in our devotional reading of those precious compositions, and always, we think, with real profit to ourselves; and, as it appears to us, to the imparting of additional force and beauty to portions of the Divine Word. We are not desirous to make out a case, any further than it becomes us to be desirous to do good, and are by no means confident that the view we take will be acquiesced in by others. We only repeat that we have been thereby benefited ourselves, and shall rejoice if our humble attempt may

* And truly no good man can be indifferent as to the influence of the principles which he may adopt or sanction, especially in such a day as this, when Hottentots, it seems, are making proselytes of English dignitaries sent to instruct them in the Gospel; and the votaries of the degrading superstition of Pantheism, after endeavoring to revive its putrid carcass, and to set it up in the temple of their Dagon, are assaying to clothe it in a garb which shall captivate the fancy, and lead into the depths of ruinous error them who, having learned through the speculations of sciolists to regard pedantry as Science, are prepared to receive as truth any thing which teaches them to set lightly by the doctrines of the Cross of Christ, and the teachings of the revealed will of God.

be blessed to the awakening of more interest in the too much neglected Book of Psalms.

That the refrain or chorus (in the popular sense of this term) was employed in the performance of the Temple service, (that is, when the Psalms were introduced,) will not, we think, be questioned by any one who has carefully examined the subject. And it seems equally evident that the whole assembly united in the chorus, as on Mounts Ebal and Gerizzim the assembled tribes gave the emphatic *Amen* to the enunciation of the blessing or the curse. (Deut. xxvii: 11-26). In fact the construction of many Psalms evince it, as it appears to us, though we do not present this point as an issue in the argument; for whether it be admitted or rejected is unimportant, so far as regards our hypothesis respecting the meaning of *Selah*. The band of performers alone may have introduced the *chorus*; and then again the whole assembly may have united with the performers in the chorus, which we are inclined to think was frequently the fact. And then, in order to guard against misapprehension, in respect to a matter to which we shall have occasion to refer presently, we would here remark that repetitions are not necessarily either refrains or choruses, as is apparent from Ps. cvii, where, in verses 6, 13, 19, 28, there is a repetition entering into the historical construction of the Psalm, while the chorus is given in verses 8, 15, 21, 31. Then, in Psalm cxxxvi, the chorus follows each verse from the beginning of the Psalm to its conclusion—the choir of singers and of performers on instruments leading the historical narrative as given in the former part of each verse, and the whole assembly, as we think, uniting in the concluding chorus, “*For His mercy endureth forever.*” * And we are fully assured that such choruses were more general in the Temple service, and that they were provided for

* Mohammed instituted no Temple service in any way analogous to that of the Jews; but being ignorant of the design and use of the chorus as given in the Psalter, he, with a view of imitating the Divine Word as closely as possible, wrote an ode or song which, in its whole construction, is patterned after this Psalm; thus furnishing a chorus without providing for its performance. Or, perhaps, the Jew who aided him in writing the Koran, prepared the song with the ely purpose of casting ridicule upon the preposterous pretensions of the false prophet. We refer to the matter from memory, and can not, therefore, mention the part of the Koran in which this imitation is found.

more extensively than now appears in the written out refrains which are expressed *verbatim* in the Psalms; and, also, that *Selah*, in its design and use, relates to this matter, as we shall attempt somewhat fully to show.

As to the portion of the Psalm to which the worshiper, as directed by *Selah*, was to return for the purpose of repeating, there seems to be no ground for hesitation or doubt respecting it, as we think will fully appear in the course of this discussion. Repetition is characteristic of many of the Psalms; sometimes it is fully written out and expressed, and at other times indicated by *Selah*. Thus, for example, in Ps. cxxix: 1, 2, (one of the Songs of Degrees), the Psalmist says: "*Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, may Israel now say: many a time have they afflicted me from my youth; yet they have not prevailed against me.*" Or take still another example from Ps. xciv, the first verse of which reads thus: "*O Lord God, to whom vengeance belongeth; O God, to whom vengeance belongeth, show Thyself.*" In these instances, taken from the first verse of the Psalms, the intensifying repetition is fully written out or expressed. But if we refer to the first verse of Ps. lxxvii, we find that it terminates in *Selah*: "God be merciful unto us and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us, *Selah*;" which, as we understand the term, requires the worshiper to return and repeat; and thus the first and second verses, with *Selah*, (as above explained), would read as follows: "God be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us; (*God be merciful unto us and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us;*) that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations." Here *Selah* indicates the intensifying repetition, (in which all the congregation of worshipers may have united,) which, in the other specified instances, is fully written out or expressed. And that the reiteration does impart intensity and beauty to the passage, will hardly be questioned.

The word also frequently occurs in the *second* verse of a Psalm, as also in the third and fourth verses of others. We shall cite, in illustration of our subject, a few instances of each, substituting therein for *Selah* the words of the refrain itself. Though it may be in point to remark in this connection, that if we may, in illustration of the use of *Selah*, as indicating the chorus, take those Psalms in which the refrain or chorus is fully expressed or written out, it will be in some cases doubtful whether the whole of the first

verse is to be substituted for that word, or only the first clause: since, in the Psalms in which the refrain is fully given, we sometimes have the whole of the first verse repeated, (see Ps. viii and cxviii,) and in others only the first clause. (See Ps. ciii, and cxlvi.) We shall, in our illustrations, preserve uniformity in the citations, without attempting to decide the question for our readers. It is obvious, however, that the same variety may have existed in both cases.

In the following citations *Selah* is found at the end of the second verse of the Psalm, and in lieu of it we shall substitute the refrain, inclosing it in parenthesis, as above:

"Lord, how are they increased that trouble me? many are they that rise up against me. Many there be which say of my soul, There is no help for him in God. (*Lord, how are they increased that trouble me? many are they that rise up against me.*) But Thou, O Lord, art a shield for me; my glory, and the lifter up of my head." Ps. iii: 1-3.

"The king shall joy in Thy strength, O Lord; and in Thy salvation, how greatly shall he rejoice? Thou hast given him his heart's desire; and hast not withholden the request of his lips. (*The King shall joy in Thy strength, O Lord; and in Thy salvation how greatly shall he rejoice?*) For Thou preventest him with the blessings of goodness; Thou settest a crown of pure gold upon his head." Ps. xxi: 1-3.

"God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; He judgeth among the gods. How long will ye judge unjustly: and accept the persons of the wicked? (*God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; He judgeth among the gods.*) Defend the poor and fatherless: do justice to the afflicted and needy." Ps. lxxxii: 1-3.

"Lord, Thou hast been favorable unto Thy land; Thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob. Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of Thy people, Thou hast covered all their sin. (*Lord, Thou hast been favorable unto Thy land; Thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob.*) Thou hast taken away all Thy wrath: Thou hast turned Thyself from the fierceness of Thine anger." Ps. lxxxv: 1-3.

In these citations we have added also the verse which follows the refrain, simply to show how easily and fully the refrain itself falls in with the whole context, imparting additional force and beauty to the whole. Yet a moment's reflection will show that it

would be unreasonable to expect that a chorus, interrupting, as it often does, a narrative, should, in all cases, so connect with what follows it as to become, as it were, a part of the narrative itself. Such is never the design of a chorus; and it can, therefore, constitute no valid objection to our hypothesis, that it may not in all cases meet such imaginary conditions. We shall now cite a few of the instances in which *Selah* occurs in the *third* verse:

"The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; the name of the God of Jacob defend thee. Send thee help from the sanctuary, and strengthen thee out of Sion. Remember all thy offerings, and accept thy burnt sacrifices. (*The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; the name of the God of Jacob defend thee.*) Grant thee according to thine own heart, and fulfill all thy counsel." Ps. xx: 1-4.

"Why boastest thou thyself in mischief, O mighty man? the goodness of God endureth continually. Thy tongue deviseth mischiefs; like a sharp razor, working deceitfully. Thou lovest evil more than good; and lying rather than to speak righteousness. (*Why boastest thou thyself in mischief, O mighty man? the goodness of God endureth continually.*) Thou lovest all devouring words, O thou deceitful tongue." Ps. lii: 1-4.

"Save me, O God, by Thy name, and judge me by Thy strength. Hear my prayer, O God: give ear to the words of my mouth. For strangers are risen up against me, and oppressors seek after my soul; they have not 'set Thee before them. (*Save me, O God, by Thy name, and judge me by Thy strength.*) Behold! God is mine helper; the Lord is with them that uphold my soul." Ps. liv: 1-4.

In this instance, as also in the following, the last verse of the citation commences a new paragraph in the Psalm:

"In Judah God is known; His name is great in Israel. In Salem also is His tabernacle, and His dwelling-place in Sion. There brake he the arrows of the bow, the shield, and the sword, and the battle. (*In Judah God is known; His name is great in Israel.*) Thou art more glorious and excellent than the mountains of prey." Ps. lxxvi: 1-4.

"I cried unto God with my voice, even unto God with my voice; and He gave ear unto me. In the day of my trouble I sought the Lord: my soul ran in the night, and ceased not: my soul refused to be comforted. I remembered God, and was troubled: I complained, and my spirit was overwhelmed. (*I cried unto God with*

my voice, even unto God with my voice; and He gave ear unto me.) Thou holdest mine eyes waking: I am so troubled that I can not speak." Ps. lxxvii: 1-4.

In the following citations *Selah* occurs in the fourth verse of the Psalm:

"O clap your hands, all ye people: shout unto God with the voice of triumph. For the Lord Most High is terrible; He is a great King over all the earth. He shall subdue the people under us, and the nations under our feet. He shall choose our inheritance for us, the excellency of Jacob whom he loved. (*O clap your hands, all ye people: shout unto God with the voice of triumph.*) God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet." Ps. xlvii: 1-5.

"O God, Thou hast cast us off, Thou hast scattered us, Thou hast been displeased; O turn Thyself to us again. Thou hast made the earth to tremble; Thou hast broken it: heal the breaches thereof; for it shaketh. Thou hast showed Thy people hard things; Thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment. Thou hast given a banner to them that feared Thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth. (*O God, Thou hast cast us off, Thou hast scattered us, Thou hast been displeased; O turn Thyself to us again.*) That Thy beloved may be delivered; save with Thy right hand, and hear me." Ps. lx: 1-5.

"Hear my cry, O God; attend unto my prayer. From the end of the earth will I cry unto Thee, when my heart is overwhelmed: lead me to the rock that is higher than I. For Thou hast been a shelter for me, and a strong tower from the enemy. I will abide in Thy tabernacle forever; I will trust in the covert of Thy wings. (*Hear my cry, O God; attend unto my prayer.*) For Thou, O God, hast heard my vows: Thou hast given me the heritage of those that fear Thy name." Ps. lxi: 1-5.

"Truly my soul waiteth upon God: from Him cometh my salvation. He only is my rock and my salvation; He is my defense; I shall not be greatly moved. How long will ye imagine mischief against a man? ye shall be slain all of you: as a bowing wall shall ye be, and as a tottering fence. They only consult to cast him down from his excellency: they delight in lies: they bless with their mouth, but they curse inwardly. (*Truly my soul waiteth upon God: from Him cometh my salvation.*) My soul wait

thou only upon God; for my expectation is from Him." Ps. lxii: 1-5.

The above instances, thus regularly cited according to the use of *Selah* in the first four verses of the Psalms, may suffice for this method of illustration. It is needless to cite all the instances of its use, and while we concede that some may not be so obvious as illustrations of our hypothesis, as others, yet we have found none which, upon a thorough consideration, appeared to be inconsistent with the exposition we have given of the word; or with the use of the chorus, in instances where it confessedly exists, in other parts of the Psalter. But we shall now proceed to take, more at random, a few other instances for the fuller and more thorough illustration of our subject.

We have supposed (what, however, we regard as susceptible of actual demonstration,) that the whole body of Jewish worshippers, occasionally, at least, and when on the great festive occasions the Psalms were introduced into the service, united with the band of singers and players on instruments, in repeating whatever choruses existed in the Psalms which were performed. We have no means or authorities at hand, except the Bible, to verify this representation, (being with our regiment, encamped in the interior of Arkansas, without books, and far away from all such appliances;) but shall not hesitate to take it for granted, assured as we are that it is really the fact; though, as already remarked, the issue is of no importance as regards our general argument. And we advert to it only for the sake of the force and beauty which the idea seems to impart to the illustration of several of the Psalms, to which we shall now refer. Though the illustration would be sufficiently complete, even on the supposition that these choruses were not joined in by the whole congregation, but were performed by the bands of musicians alone. But we think the effect is very much heightened by supposing that all the congregation united therein.*

* That the congregation, during the public worship of God, was accustomed to join in the chorus, seems to be plainly intimated in the Scriptures. On the occasion of the removal of the Ark from Kirjath-jearim—a grand festive occasion—"David and all Israel played before God, with all their might, with singing, and with harps," etc. 1 Chr. xiii: 8. "So David and all the House of Israel brought up the Ark of the Lord with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet." 2 Sam.

As an illustrative instance of this, and one which likewise confirms our hypothesis as to the design and use of *Selah*, we may cite the sixty-eighth Psalm, in which that word occurs several times, and first at the end of v. 7, and in the middle of a sentence. The refrain is in v. 1, (where it always is in Psalms in which *Selah* is used,) and consists of those majestic words employed by the Priests on taking up the Ark, as Israel resumed her march through the wilderness: "*Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered: let them also that hate Him, flee before Him.*" (See Numbers xi: 35.) The Psalm tends powerfully to remind the people of Israel of the thrilling scenes connected with their exodus from Egypt; their march through the wilderness, and their conquest of the promised land; and we may easily imagine how—in the performance of it in the Temple service, by the mighty band of singers and instrumental performers—every heart would thrill with emotion as the opening words were sounded forth. We can not here quote the whole Psalm, nor is it necessary for the pur-

vi: 15, and 1 Chr. xv: 28. And at the close of the Psalm, which David had prepared for the occasion, and which was performed on that day by Asaph and his brethren, we read that "*All the people said, Amen, and praised the Lord.*" 1 Chr. xvi: 4-36. The same words are employed respecting them on another occasion, where the congregation had been assembled. Neh. v: 13. And on still another occasion it is said "*All the people cried, Amen! Amen! with lifting up of their hands.*" Neh. viii: 6. Again: "*And David said to all the congregation, Now bless the Lord your God: and all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads and worshiped,*" etc. 1 Chr. xxix: 20. See, also, Neh. ix: 5. And at the conclusion of Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple, it is said that "*when all the children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshiped, and praised the Lord, saying, For He is good: for His mercy endureth forever.*" 2 Chr. vii: 3. Here is a direct reference to the fact that the multitude joined in uttering forth this familiar chorus of the Psalms. See, likewise, Jer. xxxiii: 11. The same, too, is clear from Ezra iii: 10-13, at the laying of the foundation of the Temple. Compare, also, 1 Chr. vi: 31-39; Neh. xii: 24-47.

Their "*giving thanks by course,*" (See Ezra iii: 11,) and the two companies that gave thanks in the Temple, Neh. xii: 40, have, doubtless, reference to David's arrangement of the choir; whose daily choir for the Tabernacle was not less than 166. That the women participated in these performances is, perhaps, not unlikely. See Exod. xv: 20-21; 2 Chr. xxxiv: 25.

pose of illustration. But let the refrain with which the Psalm opens be fully expressed at the end of verse 7, where *Selah* occurs to indicate it, and the whole sentence would read as follows: "O God, when Thou wentest forth before Thy people, when Thou didst march through the wilderness: (*Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered: let them also that hate Him flee before Him*): the earth shook, the heavens dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel." Thus, at the pause in the narrative, which brings to mind so forcibly God's interposition on behalf of their fathers, the whole congregation, as one man, utter forth the words of this noble chorus; and we may easily imagine the effect as it is thus sounded forth by all the worshippers.

The illustration of the design and use of *Selah* in the other two verses in which it occurs in the Psalm is little less striking, but our space forbids us to introduce them.

In Ps. xlv, it is likewise employed three times, and in two of them in connection with a fully expressed or written out repetition. In v. 1, the noble refrain is given: "*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble;*" and at the end of each of the three strophes or divisions, into which the Psalm is arranged, *Selah* follows to indicate a repetition of this refrain or chorus. *Selah*, as indicating this chorus, follows verses 3, 7, 11; and in v. 7 the words occur, (which are repeated also in v. 11): "The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge." This repetition may, indeed, be a second refrain; but there is no necessity for supposing it to be so. For, as already remarked, a repetition is not always a chorus, even in sacred Psalmody. And, as an illustration in point, Ps. xxxix: 5, 11, may be cited, in which, and immediately preceding *Selah*, (as in the Psalm before us,) a sentiment is repeated, but with sufficient variations in the expression to show that it could not have been employed as a refrain. And thus, although in two of the verses of Ps. xlv, which immediately precede *Selah*, the aforesaid words occur, there is no reason for supposing them to be a part of the chorus.

A very brief analysis of this most sublime composition, (after which we shall quote it in full,) will, we think, go far toward evincing what was the true meaning and use of *Selah* in the ancient Church.

In the *first* strophe, and after announcing the refrain, the Psalm-

ist dwells upon the Almighty power and goodness of God; and declares that, amid all the commotions of earth and tribulations of His people, God is their dependence. We shall not fear, though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. And the strophe ends with *Selah*, the whole congregation (when it was performed in the Temple) joining therein, "*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*"

In the *second* strophe, and, as connected with the same great truths, he refers to the security and blessedness of the Church: "God is in the midst of her: she shall not be moved; God shall help her, and that right early;" and, likewise, to the manner in which God frustrated the efforts of the heathen to destroy her. And the strophe closes with these words, (to which *Selah* is added), "The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge." Upon which the whole congregation chime in, and in one grand chorus exclaim, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble;" thus intensifying and appropriating to themselves the previous utterance.

In the *third* strophe he still dwells upon the theme, and shows how the Almighty power of God is exercised in chastising the nations by war's desolations; and then by healing those desolations: thus evincing that He only is God; and that His purpose is to be exalted among the nations, and in the earth. The strophe then ends in the same sublime manner as delineated above.

And now let our readers peruse this majestic Psalm, and picture to themselves the mighty assemblage of worshipers in the Temple on some festive occasion uniting in performing it. The singers and players on instruments lead off in the song; and then, as they approach the end of these strophes, the whole congregation with one voice unite in avouching Jehovah to be their God: "*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*"

The following is the Psalm in full, with the chorus substituted for *Selah*:

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. (*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*)

"There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early. The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved: He uttered His voice, the earth melted. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. (*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*)

"Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations He hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; He burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. (*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*)"

We may here, in passing, advert to a fact brought to view by this Psalm, and which is deserving of consideration by those who, like Gesenius, maintain that *Selah* is designed merely to indicate a pause. It is this: that *Selah* repeatedly occurs, as in this instance, at the end of a Psalm. (Compare Ps. iii, and ix, and xxiv.) Now, on what principle would the advocates of this theory maintain their exposition of the word in view of such a fact? If that imaginary Hibernian, who seems to have appropriated to himself, without acknowledgment, the bulls and blunders of all ages and nations, might be supposed to need the direction to stop when he could go no farther, it can hardly be supposed that the ancient Israelites needed to be informed that they must pause when they had got to the end of the Psalm. There certainly could have been no likelihood of their continuing to sing when they had nothing to sing; and, therefore, we can hardly suppose a necessity for directing them to pause when they had arrived at the end. But, in contrast with this, and in further illustration and confirmation of our own position, it may be remarked in this connection, that the *first* verse, or part of the first verse, of a Psalm is, in repeated instances, (in Psalms where *Selah* is not employed,) reiterated in the *last* verse of that Psalm. See, for example, Ps. viii: 1, 9, and ciii: 1, 22, and civ: 1, 35, and cxviii: 1, 29. While *Selah*, therefore, standing at the end of a Psalm, could hardly be explained as a direction to the performer to pause, it may, of course, and as our exposition of it requires, be employed for directing to a similar repetition with that contained in the Psalms here referred to.

In Ps. lix: 16, to which we have already briefly referred, the expression, "*Higgaion. Selah*," occurs. *Higgaion*, which we think should have been rendered into English by our translators, here means, as Dr. Alexander * shows, "*Meditation*." The idea seems to be, "Here is a subject which preëminently calls for meditation," and it is equivalent to the injunction, "*Consider this*," or "*Meditate hereon*." *Selah*, indicating the refrain, follows this direction, and the whole passage, including the refrain and verses 9 and 10, would then read as follows:

"The Lord is known by the judgment which He executeth: the wicked is snared in the work of his own hands. *CONSIDER THIS.* (*I will praise Thee, O Lord, with my whole heart; I will shew forth all Thy marvelous works.*) The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." And in like manner, also, after the last verse of the Psalm (wherein *Selah* occurs), the worshiper repeats in the refrain his purpose to live for the glory of God, whatever course the wicked may resolve to pursue.

In further illustration, let us take also Ps. xxxii, the first verse of which contains that joyous and triumphant expression of the renewed soul, which has been by such reiterated millions of times in every succeeding age: "*Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.*" We may call to mind how Job longed to realize the truth of this, when he exclaimed in those memorable words, "How can man be just (justified) with God?" David, in this Psalm, (as Paul in Rom. vii,) describes the deep inwrought expression of his soul in relation to the whole matter, from the beginning of his conviction of sin, until full hope and assurance took possession of his heart. At first, and in the midst of his distressing doubts and fears, when "his moisture was turned into the drought of summer," he most earnestly longs to realize this blessedness, and exclaims, "Blessed is he," etc., † (v. 4.) That is,

* I much regret that I have not had the opportunity, during the preparation of this essay, to consult the Exposition of the Psalms by this greatly lamented scholar and divine, who, truly, has left no compeer in those departments of sacred literature which he so adorned. Before entering our present military post, the opportunity was afforded for transcribing the extract given in our first paragraph; the other references are from recollection alone.

† אֲשֶׁר-אֵין עֲוֹן אֲשֶׁר נֶשְׂחָט literally, *O, the blessedness of him—of the man, etc. אֲשֶׁר, blessedness, is a noun masculine, (occurring only in the plural con-*

O that I could realize this blessedness, for, of all men, I am most wretched. He then proceeds to describe how he found this blessedness through the free and full forgiveness of sin, (v. 5,) at the end of which he, in the joy of his soul, as a ransomed and saved sinner, speaking from sweet experience, exclaims, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." And then, after uttering words of further exultation, and avouching the Lord to be his hiding place and Saviour, he (v. 7) repeats in ecstasy the same glorious refrain: "*Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.*" The effect of this reiteration, as uttered in the Temple service, can be easily conceived.

In Ps. lxvi, *Selah* is likewise repeated three times. The first verse, or refrain, is, "Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands"—a glorious chorus to be publicly sounded forth in the service of the Jewish Temple. *Selah* occurs after v. 4, which, with the refrain, would read thus: "All the earth shall worship Thee, and shall sing unto Thee; they shall sing to Thy name. (*Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands.*)" The same is, with equal force and beauty, repeated after v. 7: "He ruleth by His power forever; His eyes behold the nations: let not the rebellious exalt themselves. (*Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands.*)" And so, also, in v. 15, and after proclaiming his own purpose to glorify God, he, by repeating the refrain, calls upon all the earth to join with him therein: "I will offer unto Thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the increase of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats. (*Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands.*)"

The only Psalm in which *Selah* occurs four times is the eighty-ninth, and its occurrence, as indicating the chorus, is just as striking as the chorus four times fully expressed in Psalm cvii, to which we have already referred. Let the refrain in vs. 8, 15, 21, 31 of this latter Psalm, and which is fully expressed, be taken and compared with the refrain as indicated by *Selah* in the former; and we entertain but little doubt as to the result. Both are lengthy Psalms; the one containing forty-three verses, and the other fifty-two. The refrain of Ps. lxxxix is: "*I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever: with my mouth will I make known Thy faithfulness to all gen-*

struct;) but it may often be explained adverbially, as in this instance: "*O, how blessed is he whose sins are forgiven!*" etc.; or, Ps. i: 1, "*How blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the wicked,*" etc. See, also, Ps. lxxv: 5, and cxviii: 1.

erations;" and the refrain of Psalm cvii is: "*O that men would praise the Lord for His goodness, and for His wonderful works to the children of men!*" As the subject of a chorus, therefore, the one sentiment is just as striking and appropriate as the other; and on that ground there can be no valid objection against regarding *Selah* as indicating a chorus. Nor can any valid objection be raised on the ground of a supposed want of connection between the chorus and the context, (a point to which we have already referred,) which will not be equally applicable to both. And this is not only true in regard to the instance before us, but in every instance of a supposed want of connection between a chorus, as indicated by *Selah*, and the context. For there are repeated instances where the refrain is fully written out or expressed, in which the obvious connection (if such connection be deemed necessary,) is as difficult to perceive, as there can be in any of the instances where the refrain is indicated by the employment of *Selah*. See, for example, Ps. cxxxvi; 10, 16-22.

We have not space in which to illustrate the employment of *Selah* in the four instances of its use in the foregoing Psalm, and we shall now briefly glance at some of the Psalms in which it is found only once or twice:

In Ps. lix, *Selah* is used twice. The refrain is: "*Deliver me from mine enemies, O my God; deliver me from them that rise up against me;*" which, if repeated after verses 5 and 13, in which *Selah* is found, seems to impart great intensity to the supplication. The following are the passages, with the refrain added:

"Thou therefore, O Lord God of hosts, the God of Israel, awake to visit all the heathen: be not merciful to any wicked transgressors. (*Deliver me from mine enemies, O my God; deliver me from them that rise up against me.*) They return at evening: they make a noise like a dog, and go round about the city." Vs. 5, 6.

"Consume them in wrath, consume them, that they may not be: and let them know that God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth. (*Deliver me from mine enemies, O my God; deliver me from them that rise up against me.*) And at evening let them return; and let them make a noise like a dog, and go round about the city. Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied." Vs. 13-15.

The effect of this reiteration, in imparting great intensity and beauty to the passage, seems still more manifest, if possible, in

Ps. lxii, in which, also, *Selah* is used twice. The refrain, as given in v. 1, is: "Truly my soul waiteth upon God: from Him cometh my salvation." The Psalm is divided into three strophes, the first of which contains an admonition to the Psalmist's enemies. And he presents his unfaltering hope in God, as an offset to their perpetual and malignant efforts to malign and destroy him. "They only consult to cast him down from his excellency: they delight in lies: they bless with their mouth, but they curse inwardly. (*Truly my soul waiteth upon God: from Him cometh my salvation.*) My soul, wait thou ONLY upon God; for my expectation is from Him." Vs. 4, 5.

It occurs, likewise, at the end of the second strophe, (v. 8,) in which David, after enlarging on the idea presented above, proceeds to exhort his fellow men: "Trust in Him at all times; ye people, pour out your heart before Him: God is a refuge for us. (*Truly my soul waiteth upon God: from Him cometh my salvation.*) Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lie: to be laid in the balance, they are altogether lighter than vanity." Vs. 8, 9.

What can be imagined more beautiful and impressive than the whole worshipping assembly, amid all the imposing grandeur of the Temple service, thus uttering forth these refrains!

In Ps. lxxxiv, also, *Selah* is employed twice. The first verse or refrain is: "How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts!" The Psalmist then referring to the fact that he had been, for some cause, deprived of the privilege of attending "the courts of the Lord," though he greatly desired and sought to be there present; urges his prayer by a reference to the fact that even the sparrow has found the nest which she sought; and the swallow, also, a place where to lay her young, while he was in vain seeking the altars of God.* He, then, in vs. 4, 5, adds the following words,

* That such is the meaning of this passage, I can not doubt. The translation, "Yea, the sparrow hath found a house, and the swallow a place," etc., gives a very inadequate view of the language of the original, *וַיֵּבֶן צִפְּרִיּוֹן בַּיִת וְהַשְּׁלָלָה מָצְאָה מָקוֹם*; and in fact it seems impossible to translate the verse so as to give the sense without paraphrase. *וַיֵּבֶן*, (*dictio augenda significationis vim habens*, as Bythner somewhere felicitously terms it,) does not here mean *yea*, but *even*, as in v. 2. "My soul longeth *and even* (*וַיֵּבֶן*) fainteth;" and Ps. xxiii: 4, "*Even* though I walk through the valley," etc. And *מָצְאָה* is not simply to *find*, as when one stumbles upon a

in connection with which *Selah* occurs, for which we shall substitute the refrain: "Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house: they will be still praising Thee. (*How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts!*) Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee," etc. Then, in the eighth verse, to which *Selah* is added, he fervently implores God to hear his prayer, and to restore him to those blessed courts, which were so amiable in his sight: "O Lord God of hosts, hear my prayer: give ear, O God of Jacob. (*How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts!*) Behold, O God, our shield, and look upon the face of Thine anointed. For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness." V. 7-10.

In Ps. lxxxviii, *Selah* is likewise employed twice. The first verse or refrain is as follows: "O Lord God of my salvation, I have cried day and night unto Thee." And let our readers note how this appeal to God becomes intensified by the repetitions indicated by *Selah*: "Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deeps. Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and Thou hast afflicted me with all Thy waves. (*O Lord God of my salvation, I have cried day and night unto Thee.*) Thou hast put away mine acquaintance far from me; Thou hast made me an abomination unto them: I am shut up, and I can not come forth. Mine eye

thing by accident; but, unless my recollection is wholly at fault, it is frequently employed in the sense of *finding that which we are seeking*, as in Ps. lxix: 20, "I looked . . . for comforters, but I *found* none" Ps. cvii: 4, "They *found* no city to dwell in," much as they, in their fainting and wandering, desired a dwelling place. Ps. cxxxiii: 7, "Lo, we heard of it at Ephrata: we *found* it in the fields of the wood." And such is its meaning in the passage before us. The Psalmist is pleading with God to restore him to those blessed courts and altars to which he so earnestly sought to return, and urges his plea by referring to God's Providential care of His inferior creatures: "Even the sparrow hath found the house which she sought; and the swallow the place she sought in which to lay her young; so enable me to find what I seek, even thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God."

The use of the parenthesis would render the sense clear without supplying any thing: "My soul longeth, and even fainteth for the Courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God; (even the sparrow hath found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself where she may lay her young;) even thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God."

mourneth by reason of affliction: Lord, I have called daily upon Thee, I have stretched out my hands unto Thee. Wilt Thou shew wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? (*O Lord God of my salvation, I have cried day and night unto Thee.*) Shall Thy loving kindness be declared in the grave?" etc. Vs. 6-11.

In regard to the Psalms in which *Selah* occurs but once, (which are far the most numerous,) a very few instances must suffice:

In Ps. xliv, *Selah* occurs in the eighth verse, which we here cite with the refrain, as given in v. 1 and indicated by *Selah*: "In God we boast all the day long, and praise Thy name forever. (*We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work Thou didst in their days, in the times of old.*) But Thou hast cast off, and put us to shame; and goest not forth with our armies." Vs. 8, 9.

In Ps. xlviii, it occurs after v. 8, which we subjoin with the refrain as thereby indicated: "As we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the Lord of hosts, in the city of our God: God will establish it forever. (*Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of His holiness.* We have thought of Thy loving kindness, O God, in the midst of Thy Temple." Vs. 8, 9.

In Ps. lxxxix, *Selah* occurs in like manner at the end of the 7th verse: "Thou calledst in trouble, and I delivered thee; I answered thee in the secret place of thunder: I proved thee at the waters of Meribah. (*Sing aloud unto God our strength: make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob.*) Hear, O my people, and I will testify unto thee: O Israel, if Thou wilt hearken unto me."

In Ps. lxxxiii, which is the last instance we shall thus cite, *Selah* follows the 8th verse, with great and intensifying power. After announcing in v. 1 the following refrain: "*Keep not Thou silence, O God: hold not Thy peace, and be not still, O God,*" the Psalmist proceeds to present the reasons for this petition, to-wit: the enemies of God were making a tumult, and had risen up and conspired against His people; and "are confederate against Thee: the tabernacles of Edom, and the Ishmaelites; of Moab, and the Hagarenes; Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek; the Philistines, with the inhabitants of Tyre; Assur also is joined to them: they have holpen the children of Lot. (*Keep not Thou silence, O God: hold not Thy peace, and be not still, O God.*) Do unto them as

unto the Midianites; as to Sisera, as to Jabin, at the brook of Kison." V. 5-8.

Can any thing be more appropriate or more intensifying than the substitution of the refrain for *Selah* in this connection? But we shall not attempt further to enlarge on this and the other instances adduced in illustration and confirmation of our position; (for there are other points to which we wish to call attention in the connection,) but shall leave them as they are, to make what impression they may upon the serious and thoughtful reader.

Should any thing be deemed necessary in further illustration and confirmation of the statement that *Selah*, containing, as we suppose, a direction to the worshiper to pause, and return to some portion of the Psalm already performed, can only indicate the first verse, or a portion of that verse as the part of the Psalm to be repeated, let it be observed that in no Psalm which contains *Selah* is the first verse ever repeated, for no Psalm in which that verse is repeated, (instances of which we have cited above,) contains the word. Refrains are found in many of the Psalms, but, unless contained in v. 1, are always written out in full.

Take, for example, Psalm cvii, which contains four formal repetitions, (v. 6, 13, 19, 28,) and likewise a refrain fully repeated four times, (v. 8, 15, 21, 31,) neither of which, however, is found in the first verse. In Psalm cxxxvi, also, the refrain, ("*for His mercy endureth forever,*") being at the end of v. 1, could not be indicated by *Selah*, and is therefore written out or expressed in full at the end of every verse of the Psalm. While in that exquisitely beautiful Psalm, (the 80th,) the refrain, "*Turn us again, O God, and cause Thy face to shine; and we shall be saved,*" occurs in vs. 3, 7, 19; but it could not be indicated by *Selah*, as it does not begin the Psalm. * The touching and beautiful refrain in Ps. xlii may also be cited: "*Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise Him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God.*" It occurs, with a slight variation, in vs. 5 and 11. It is repeated likewise at the end of the following Psalm, which is without a title,

* The cumulation of appellations in the reiteration of this refrain is very striking, and imparts intensity to the petition. V. 3, "*Turn us again, O God:*" etc. V. 7, "*Turn us again, O God of hosts,*" etc., and v. 19, "*Turn us again, O Jehovah, God of hosts,*" etc.

and was, perhaps, originally a third strophe or section of the Psalm.

The same result is likewise apparent if we consult those Psalms in which both *Selah* and a repetition are found: Ps. xlvii has three *Selahs* (vs. 3, 7, 11,) and likewise a repetition in vs. 7, 11, which, as we have already fully illustrated, *Selah* greatly intensifies. In Ps. xlix there are two *Selahs*, (vs. 13, 15,) indicating the refrain, "*Hear this, all ye people; give ear, all ye inhabitants of the world:*" and, also, a repetition, (with some variation,) of the following words: "*Nevertheless man being in honor abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish.*" Vs. 12, 20. The repetition is intensive, but the variation is too considerable to admit of its being regarded as a refrain. But in Ps. lxxvii there is a similar arrangement—*Selah* occurs twice, (vs. 3, 6,) indicating the refrain in v. 1: "*Be merciful unto me, O God, be merciful unto me: for my soul trusteth in Thee: yea in the shadow of Thy wings will I make my refuge, until these calamities be overpast;*" while in v. 5 the following words (which are exactly repeated in v. 11,) occur: "*Be Thou exalted, O God, above the heavens: let Thy glory be above all the earth.*" This has every appearance of being a second chorus, but *Selah* could only indicate the one announced in the first verse. See, also, Ps. xxxix: 5, 11.

Still, should any of our readers, who may coincide with us in our exposition of the word as an abbreviation, dissent from our view as to the verse designated by *Selah* for repetition, and suppose that, instead of the first verse of the Psalm, the verse in which *Selah* occurs should be repeated, we certainly are not unwilling that they should entertain that idea, if they can do so on a review of the whole subject. But we can not adopt such a hypothesis, not only for the reasons given above, but for others which seem to us to bear directly against such a supposition. There may be, and doubtless are, passages where *Selah* occurs, and also where it does not occur, which would bear such repetition—as there are passages in which the "*for ever*" (לְעֹלָם) of the Talmudists would not seem improper as a substitute for the word. (See e. g., Ps. iii and xlvii.) But this proves nothing in either case, if the theory should be found inadmissible on the ground of all analogy and contrary to the recognized principles of hermeneutics. If *Selah* occur in v. 1, that verse is, of course, to be repeated—as we have illustrated by an example. For, in the Psalms with

Selah, the first verse being the refrain, it must be repeated after every verse in which the word occurs, in whatever part of the Psalm that may be—just as the chorus is repeated in other Psalms where *Selah* is not found. But, in the case supposed, the repetition would be contrary to all analogy, either in the Psalter or anywhere else in the Scriptures; so that in regard to this feature, at least, it would throw the *first*, *second* and *third* books out of all analogical resemblance to or sympathy with the others; for, though in the others we frequently find a single clause *immediately repeated*, a whole verse never is; while, on the contrary, the supposition that *Selah* indicates a refrain, is supported by many striking analogies, as we have abundantly shown.*

We have already adverted to the somewhat remarkable fact that in the first three books of the Jewish Psalter, as partitioned by the ancient Jewish Church, *Selah* is employed not less than sixty-seven times, while in the last two it is employed but four. † Yet reiteration, for the purpose of imparting intensity to the expression, has ever been regarded as characteristic of the Psalter. ‡ And, though there is no reason to conclude that all repetition therein is for this purpose alone, it will, nevertheless, not be assuming too much to affirm that such is undoubtedly the design of the chorus or refrain. We have no intention, however, to raise

* We might also add that the words סב לטקלה הוֹר, into which, as above shown, we have resolved *Selah*, are utterly averse to any such construction. In its literal sense סבכ means *to go around, to surround, encompass*, etc. Ps. lix: 6, 14, and xlviii: 12, (13,) and xvii: 11, and xxii: 16, (17.) עִלָּה is *to ascend*. Ps. lxviii: 18, (19,) and cxlii: 4. Its derivative, as above given, with the ל prefix, is found in the title of Ps. cxi, שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלֹת, *a song of degrees, or of the ascending grades*. (In the other thirteen of these Psalms, the title is without this prefix.) Compare, also, Ps. lxxxi: 10, (11,) cxxxv: 7. The word literally means *upward*, (as מַסָּב means *downward*;) and hence סבכֵּלָה means *from above*. The proper meaning of the phrase, therefore, is, *Da Capo*; or, *Let the singer return upward*; that is, to the beginning of the Psalm.

† The *third* and *fourth* books each contains seventeen Psalms; yet the former employs *Selah* twenty times, and the latter not at all. The *second* book contains thirty-one Psalms, and *Selah* thirty times; while the *fifth* book contains forty-four Psalms, and *Selah* four times.

‡ How repetition is employed to give intensity, is likewise apparent from many passages of the Prophets. See, for example, Is. xl: 1, 2; Ezek. vii: 4-9, and xi: 4, 15, and xvi: 6; Joel, i: 15.

an issue here ; for the argument does not require it, since the fact that such intensive reiteration is confessedly admitted to exist in the Psalter, generally, is all that is required for the illustration of this part of our subject. Let it be noted, then, that, in accordance with the exposition we adopt of the word *Selah*, this intensifying principle is found to exist about uniformly throughout the book ; while, on any other supposition, the first three divisions of it, (that is, from Ps. i to lxxxix inclusive,) are comparatively destitute of it. We say *comparatively*, for there are frequent exceptions in Psalms where *Selah* is not employed, as may be seen, for example, by referring to Ps. xxix : 1, 2, 5-9. But in the fourth book, embracing Psalms xc-cvi, where *Selah* does not occur, and in the fifth book, where it occurs only as an exception, we find the difference very obvious and marked. In numerous instances, as illustrated above, *Selah* is dispensed with, where, if our views be correct, it might probably have been introduced. Still, in the great body of those repetitions, it could not have been used, (as we understand its import,) as in Ps. cvii, and cxxxvi, and cxliv—the refrain not being given in the first verse of the Psalm.

It is, nevertheless, very interesting to observe how the element of repetition, whether for intensity or otherwise, runs through the Psalter, and especially (as fully written out and expressed,) how it characterizes the last two books aforesaid. In the Temple service we even find a whole Psalm repeated, (compare Ps. xiv and liii) ; and then, again, a large portion of one is repeated in another, and in a somewhat different connection, (Ps. lx and cviii) ; and sometimes portions of several are repeated in one, (Ps. cxliv) ; while in Ps. cxix, it is observable, throughout its whole length of one hundred and seventy-six verses, how, in every verse, with a single exception, one or another of the following terms is inwrought into its structure, to-wit : *law, testimonies, ways, precepts, statutes, commandments, and judgments* of the Lord. It is not necessary to suppose that this repetition is simply for intensity ; yet it is by no means unlikely that such perpetual reiteration in a constantly new connection of these terms, so important as related to the revelation which God had given, was intended to impress them deeply upon both the memory and the heart.* There are, moreover,

* Note how a number of those same terms are repeated, and dwelt upon, and applied in Ps. xix : 7-11 ; and how Nehemiah also refers to them in his prayer : Neh. i : 7.

instances in the historical Psalms in which the reiteration does not appear to impart any intensity to the idea expressed and repeated, as in an example already referred to, (Ps. cvii: 6, 13, 19, 28;) very like those in Ezek. xiv: 14-20, and xx: 5-26; and in Isaiah, v: 25, and ix: 12, 17, 21, and x: 4, (in all of which the same words are reiterated.) Such repetitions may be regarded as somewhat analogous to others, which occur in many passages of the Proverbs, Job, and of the Prophets, in which, according to the genius of Hebrew poetry, the second line of a distich is designed as explanatory and confirmatory of what is advanced in the first line; although in many, and perhaps most, of these instances, the repetition, in what is called the explanatory clause, is designed for intensity.

All this may be most fully asserted, and yet it would be manifestly absurd to deny that repetitions, such as occur in the following Psalms, (and in others, some of which we have already cited, and which contain no *Selah*;) were designed to add intensity to the expression.

Take, for example, Ps. cxvi: 12, 13, and note the force and intensity imparted by repetition to the phrase, "*for He cometh.*" The whole passage reads as follows: "Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees in the wood rejoice before the Lord; for He cometh, **FOR HE COMETH** to judge the earth: He shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with His truth." Nearly the same words occur in Ps. cxviii: 8, 9, but the repetition is therein omitted, and the difference in the effect is very marked and decided: "Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together before the Lord; for He cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall He judge the world, and the people with equity."

Note, also, how, in Ps. cxv: 9-13, both force and beauty are imparted by the repetition: "*O Israel, trust in the Lord: He is their help and their shield. O house of Aaron, trust in the Lord: He is their help and their shield. Ye that fear the Lord, trust in the Lord: He is their help and their shield. The Lord hath been mindful of us: He will bless us; He will bless the house of Israel; He will bless the house of Aaron. He will bless them that fear the Lord, both small and great.*"

In Ps. cxviii, the first and last verses are the same, (in the Hebrew.) The following are the first four verses: "O give

thanks unto the Lord; for He is good: *because His mercy endureth forever.* Let Israel now say, *that His mercy endureth forever.* Let the house of Aaron now say, *that His mercy endureth forever.* Let them now that fear the Lord say, *that His mercy endureth forever."*

In verses 8-12, also, the following passage occurs: "*It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man. It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in princes. All nations compassed me about: but in the name of the Lord will I destroy them. They compassed me about; YEA, THEY COMPASSED ME ABOUT: but in the name of the Lord I will destroy them. THEY COMPASSED ME ABOUT LIKE BEES; they are quenched as the fire of thorns: for in the name of the Lord I will destroy them.*"

The 15th and 16th verses read as follows: "The voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tabernacles of the righteous: *the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly. The right hand of the Lord is exalted: the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly.*"

But it is unnecessary to quote other examples. The following may be referred to, in further illustration, however, among many others: Ps. ciii, and cxiii, and cxxx: 5, 6; and cxxv: 19-21; cxliv: 7, 8, 11; and cxvi, cxlvii, cxlviii, cxlix, cl.

Why *Selah* should have been sometimes employed to designate a chorus or refrain, and at other times the refrain be written out or expressed in full, is a question which is not unworthy of consideration in this connection. We have no explanation or theory to propound, except that which is obviously suggested by the position we have taken in reference to the meaning and use of the word itself. And though we were unable to explain it, our inability could not, we think, constitute any reasonable objection to that theory; at least until it should be shown that its partial use in the Psalms is susceptible of solution on the ground of some other theory, which either has been or may be propounded. We know of no one who has ever adopted our views as here presented, except a loved and valued brother—a fine Hebraist—to whom we suggested them many years since, and who has since passed to his heavenly inheritance. He adopted the suggestion with enthusiasm, but never wrote any thing on the subject, nor have we, at any time previous to the present, attempted to bring our views before the public. But though we can, of course, form no idea of the reception they may meet with, we certainly are entitled to protest

against an unfairness which would require, as a *sine qua non* to their reception, that we should satisfactorily explain this or any other matter in which the difficulty is alike common to all the theories which have been propounded. For it no more devolves upon us to do so, than it does upon those, who assume that *Selah* merely indicates a pause, to explain how it should have happened, that of the one hundred and fifty Psalms performed in the Temple service, the thirty-nine which contain that word are the only ones in which a pause could occur, or in which it should be deemed important or necessary. But, on the other hand, and in support of our explanation of the word, it may be remarked that the fact that *Selah* is sometimes employed to indicate the chorus; and the fact that at other times the chorus is given in full, or repeated *ipsissima verba*, are in no way inconsistent with each other, or with the liberties allowed and recognized in literary composition amongst both ancients and moderns. We know not which method of expressing or indicating the *chorus* may have been originally employed, or whether both were simultaneously used in composing. How early *Selah* was brought into use can not be ascertained, but we find it still employed as late as the times of Habakkuk. But whichever may be supposed to have been first, the employment of a second method of expression by no means necessitated the reduction to uniformity of the whole; or the substitution of the second method for the first in the instances in which the first had been already adopted and sanctioned by use. Our position, therefore, as to the use and meaning of this word, while it equalizes, as before remarked, throughout the five books of the Psalter, the element of intensive repetition, is not only not inconsistent with the state of the case as it exists therein, but, on the contrary, throws light upon it; while the opposite position, that the word is merely a musical pause, is inconsistent with many of the facts existing therein—imparts no light in the way of explaining any thing, and has induced many to regard the word as of little or no account, and even to treat it as irrelevant to the uses of the sanctuary. And thus, this wholly unsupported hypothesis has succeeded in furnishing a precedent for sustaining the impious notion of Semler aforesaid, by finding a word used and repeated seventy-four times by the Holy Spirit in the devotional part of the Scriptures, which neither is nor has been, for nearly two thousand years, of any earthly account; and from which, either intrinsically or

relatively, that is in the connection in which it is employed, nothing whatever can be learned either by suggestion or otherwise. The time has not yet arrived, whatever views of "progressive ideas," or of progression itself, we may see proper to entertain, when we can, with safety either to ourselves or to those who are under our influence, thus treat any portion of the Word of God.

We have said that the Psalms were used not only in the public worship of the Tabernacle and Temple, but that they were likewise employed for purposes of private and social devotion by the Jews, (see Ps. cxxxvii: 3, 4); as they ever have been by the Christian believer. Amid all her untold sorrows and tribulations, the Church of Christ has ever found therein the richest legacy of the Spirit of God for sustaining her spiritual life, and giving shape to her devotional meditations and her prayers. Though it is a matter for deep regret, that these precious words should be comparatively so little studied and appropriated, even by the followers of Christ, until the heavy hand of some severe affliction drives them, for counsel and consolation, to the Divine Word, and unlocks to their crushed and saddened spirits the most precious and inexhaustible treasures of this wonderful portion of that word; which, by its hallowed record of the experience, and spiritual conflicts, and trials of God's dear children in past ages, cheers their hearts, and leads them to childlike acquiescence in all the dispensations of His Providence concerning them.

To conclude, I might, and perhaps ought to have allowed the consideration, that, in my present position, it is wholly impracticable to obtain the learned treatises which have been written in the attempt to elucidate the meaning and use of the word which we have herein endeavored to explain, to operate with me, to defer the preparation of this article, until I should have had the opportunity of again consulting them; since it is only fair, and a proper tribute to the memory of those whom love for the truth (and not the debasing desire for pecuniary gain) have prompted to laborious efforts to cast light upon any portion of the Word of God, to take their labors into respectful consideration. But—as I am not aware that any writer, since the period when the meaning of *Selah* became a matter of uncertainty, has adopted the exposition of that word as here presented; and which, as it appears to me, is adapted to do good, if adopted; or to awaken interest and useful inquiry even, if rejected—I have thought it not improper to pro-

ceed with my labor. Some have, indeed, advanced the view that the word is an abbreviation for "*Return, O Singer;*" but have not, so far as I can recollect, pursued the explanation to any satisfactory results; or even to any thorough attempt to ascertain to what part of the Psalm the singer or worshiper should return. I have humbly endeavored to do so—with what success must be left to the determination of Time, as developed by the efforts of those who feel sufficient interest in the matter to give it a careful and thorough examination.

A military camp—even though there be (as there is in this instance) associated therewith the idea of all that is noble and inspiring in pursuit, and all that is sacred to freedom and humanity in the great end to be attained—would be but an indifferent and inadequate place in which to pursue investigations of this kind, even if the appliances of learning and criticism were therein available; and it is much more so in their absence. Nor should I have attempted this essay in the circumstances, had not the theme been familiar to my mind through a long period; and at the same time a little leisure permitted continuous effort in its preparation, during the days of convalescence from a long-continued and prostrating attack of fever, and during which I have not been able to perform the more arduous duties of the chaplaincy. I know full well how partiality for a favorite idea or theory may hinder the mind from perceiving difficulties which lie in the way of its adoption, and which may be very obvious to those who are not thus influenced. Nor could I, without great presumption, claim to be exempt from such a failing. I can, however, truly say that I have endeavored, patiently and sincerely, to rise superior to it, and to give full consideration to any and every difficulty which has occurred to me in the prosecution of the inquiry.

And I now commit the results to our readers, with the sincere prayer that the Holy Spirit may guide us into the knowledge of all essential truth.

BROWNSVILLE, ARK., Dec. 4, 1863.

ART. IV.—*Perjury Exemplified in Secession.*

THE degradation of public morals, which is exhibited in the loose ideas entertained on the inviolability of an oath, is one of the saddest phases presented by the present wicked insurrection. For the notion seems to prevail among both the active participants and the abettors of the rebellion, that they have perfect liberty to avail themselves of all the advantages accruing from taking an oath, and be subject to none of its penalties; that they can assume this most solemn obligation with no intention of fulfilling it, and yet be guiltless; or, after swearing with intention of fidelity, can, at their own convenience, change their purpose, and, with the facility wherewith we cast off an uncomfortable garment, can divest themselves of every restraint. It is held that the authority which imposes the obligation is not valid; that the Government has no right to exact an oath of those who do not approve of all its acts; and, therefore, they are not bound in conscience to abide by that which, for some advantage, their lips have uttered. Forgetting the truth, obvious to all but those who are corrupt in heart, that if the Federal authorities do illegally impose the oath, the sin lies in taking it—a consideration which every good man ought to weigh fully before he places himself under its requirements, else he can not be guiltless of a profane appeal to God, since he subjects himself to that which is no legitimate authority, either knowingly or without due reflection. The scandalous immorality of all who plead want of jurisdiction as an excuse for violating an oath to the Government, is self-evident to all except those who are fully set in perverseness; for the Federal authority is both constitutional and in vigorous action, and the only legal power in the land. For until a Government subverts all the ends for which it was instituted, becomes intolerably oppressive to the great body of the people, and its evils can not be met by constitutional remedies provided for its amendment, when rebellion is the only resource still left, the minority is bound to submission; unless we overturn all constituted rule, and relapse into the anarchy of barbarism. Nor was it pretended, when this insurrection began, that such a state of affairs existed. No specific act or general line of policy could be pointed to by the leaders of the rebellion wherein the General Government had oppressed them, or deprived them of any of their

vested rights. All that could be adduced in justification of the course, was the unfriendliness of the great body of the people to the special privileges of the minority, and the fear for the future that such unfriendliness would result in oppression. But the Federal officers, who assumed rule on the 4th of March, 1861, were constitutionally elected and lawfully inducted; and had the rebellious States remained faithful to their allegiance, there is not the shadow of a doubt that the laws would have been faithfully administered, with a due regard to the interests of the whole country. Besides, these powers were the visible representatives of the Divine authority on earth, and had a right to administer the Government over which, in the Providence of God, they had been called to preside. To say, then, that such an authority had no warrant to impose the obligation of an oath, or when it was so imposed should not be kept, argues a moral obliquity, consistent only with the thought that those who so hold are given over to strong delusions that they may believe a lie.

I. In order to a full understanding of the subject, it will be necessary to consider the oath in the light of a moral and legal act, and therefore it must be viewed with reference to the Divine law and the usages of civilized society. And it may be safely asserted that there are none of the teachings of Revelation more distinct than its utterances on this subject; and that the laws of nature and nations, as interpreted by the ablest publicists, are perfectly clear and explicit on all the general features, differing only on such details as are insignificant and trifling. It is necessary to the well being of society that the ideas on this subject should be settled and distinct, since it may be considered as the foundation of the social compact. For if there be no method by which we can rely on each other's veracity, if the highest and most solemn expression thereof has no binding force, then the problem of society becomes impossible; and indeed men would exhibit a repellant individuality in keeping with the delirium of those deistical philosophers, who contend that the original condition of mankind is that of mutual hostility. And still further, if, after society is formed and men united to each other by the bonds of civil law, there be no power to enforce the oath and no obligation of morality to keep it, nothing prevents the disintegration of the social compact back again into mutually repellant individuals. The violation of the judicial oath considered as the vinculum of society, is the sense

attached to the term Perjury, as used in the following pages; not the narrower meaning, which obtains in the courts of law. Legal usage confines Perjury to that species of false swearing, where a person, giving testimony under oath before a court of justice, asserts what he knows to be false in a matter vital to the question at issue. But the commonly received signification given to the term Perjury is exactly expressed by Cicero:* "What you swear from the sentiment of your mind, as conceived in words employed according to our usage, not to fulfill this is perjury."

It must be conceded that speech was given to us for the purpose of communicating our thoughts to each other; and that its intent is to subserve truth and not falsehood; to convey and not to conceal the real sentiments of the heart. He that inspired language along with the breath of life, being the God of Truth, willed that His creatures, made in His own image, should also show forth His character and attributes. Truth is, then, the normal condition of communication, and our nature is perverted by a departure from this. To advance one step further, when there is attached to the communication the assertion that it is true, there is also super-added a new obligation, differing in this, that while the naked declaration presupposed truth as its basis, this affirmation excludes falsehood by a specific caveat that its possibility has been considered and provided against. So that, by this process, a true man must deem his moral being pledged to the support of that which he asserts, and his character to stand or fall by the manner he abides by that which his lips have uttered. The naked assertion is all that is required of a man in whom the sense of virtue is complete; and hence it has been frequently doubted whether an oath was not rather an evil than a good. But it must always be borne in mind that both Revelation and human laws contemplate man just as he is; not perfect, but a fallen, sinful being, whose imperfect sense of morality must be fostered by every help, and guarded by every possible restraint. Hence the reverence for the Being that made us, and the fear of punishment from Him who has power to destroy as well as to save, comes forward as the highest and most solemn addition to the simple obligation of truthfulness. For, to the general and implied condition of veracity, which excludes falsehood negatively, is added the second obliga-

* De Off. III: 29.

tion, arising from the positive assertion that we will utter the truth, and this all crowned with the invocation of the Divine blessing, if the utterance be true, and the imprecation of the wrath of God, if it be false. It is clear that the sanctity of obligation can go no further than this; that the nature of the swearer is staked on the fulfillment of a promise thus uttered, since all his moral forces are gathered together for this effort; and if he fails, there remains no foundation upon which to lay anew the structure of his being. The usage of language proves this. For the employment of the preposition *By*, or the phrase, *in the name of*, God, shows that on the truth or falsity of the oath depends our hopes of the Divine support and protection, or the apprehension of the wrath and punishment. In the simple assertion a man swears by himself; for when he says, "I declare this to be the truth," he, in effect, asserts, By that common condition of truthfulness which is the bond of union between man and man; By my moral nature; By all the forces of that character which I sustain, as one in whose virtue and veracity my fellow men depend, I affirm the given assertion to be true. So that if the swearer is false, he then rejects his own character and his love and fear of God, and nothing remains but the abandoned wreck of his moral nature. *The oath is then only a higher, or rather the highest of all grades of obligation by which our being is pledged to the truth, and does not exclude any of the lower degrees of duty to truthfulness implied in the use of speech, and the pledge of veracity contained in a positive assertion. It has been falsely held that the oath is an evidence of disregard toward the obligation contained in a bare assertion, and that it is a superstitious usage whereby men are influenced to abide by a declaration, through fear of Divine punishment, while indifferent to the sanctity of a mere assertion. † This view holds that the oath only has reference to the wrath of God, which is deprecated; and therefore, without the oath, the punishment for falsehood could not overtake him who has broken his pledge of truthfulness. Hence it is asserted that the oath is nothing more than a means of forcing men to tell the truth, because of their fear of the immediate judgments of God upon perjury—a reviving of the

* Vide Puffendorf *De Jure Nat. et Gent.*, Lib. IV, Cap. II, § 6.

† Kant: *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*.

judicial systems of heathenism and the dark ages of Christianity, when the instantaneous interposition of Heaven was looked for to reward the innocent swearer, and punish the guilty. So it is further asserted that the oath is nugatory in the case of those who do not believe in God; not merely Deists, but those who worship false Divinities. But, however true this latter notion may be, the swearing by the name of God does not lessen, or in any way effect the general obligation to truthfulness which all men are alike subject to, whether they agree or disagree as to the validity of a formula. It is true that the oath derives the force which it possesses in the mind of a Christian, over and above the mere assertion, from a belief in God as the rewarder of fidelity and an avenger of falsehood; and hence those who do not believe in the true Divinity, may not be capable of taking upon themselves the highest obligation to be veracious.* But still they assume the most solemn kind consistent with their own low state of moral culture; and having done so, they are subject to the pains and penalties which human institutions can inflict on those guilty of perjury, since they stake all that they can of solemnity upon the form of asseveration employed by earthly tribunals for discovering truth and conserving its inviolability.

To the believer in God the oath becomes a religious act, since it is the gathering of all the powers of his moral nature in one act to obey God; for when a man calls the Supreme Being to witness the truth of his utterances and the purity of his motives, this is a renewed pledge of fealty, a witness for Him in whose hands our destiny is placed. The keeping of this oath in difficulties is a mark of obedience, a continual act of worship, and therefore the highest exercise of that probation which makes up the life of a follower of God. At the same time, as regards our fellow men, it is the discipline of the grandest of all virtues; the doing right even at the expense of private interests or feelings of favoritism, since the mutual obligations implied in oaths generally involve conflicting claims where we, or our friends, are involved; and we subject ourselves to the restraint of doing truth whether we suffer or prosper. This relation to our fellow men leads to the consideration of the manner in which an oath is to be interpreted. Here there seems no ground for mistake, except that which necessarily arises

* Puffendorf, Lib. IV, Cap. III, § 6.

from the imperfection of language. The obvious literal meaning of our words, taken in the sense which we suppose that he to whom they were addressed will comprehend them, is the measure of validity which accompanies an oath. Hence, if words are employed in a meaning different from their fair import, so that the hearer will comprehend them in another sense than that which the speaker conveys, if this be intentional on his part he can in no wise be guiltless of perjury. But if he that administers the oath chooses to hold the swearer to a sense different from that plainly conveyed therein, the latter is innocent. Hence the Jesuitical notion, that a man could innocently swear with mental reservations, is only of a piece with that monstrous system of immorality which has made the society a stench in the nostrils of every country in Christendom; and is so plainly at variance with the commonest dictates of morality, that it does not deserve a refutation. Closely allied to this is the sentiment of *Euripides, and quoted with approbation even by Cicero, that a man may swear with his tongue and be unsworn in his mind. This is with reference to those oaths which are extorted by dread of some great impending danger, by which the bodily fears are so much excited as to break down our moral nature, and therefore to render the swearer free from accountability. This theory proceeds on very low views of morality and the character of a brave man. For it is the characteristic of true morality to be immutable—remaining the same measure of duty to us whether we suffer or are rewarded. Virtue is unquestionably distinct from every consideration of pleasure or pain in the subject, and so far is objective. Besides, it is the part of a brave man to be uninfluenced by any fear except that of doing wrong; and to him there can be no evil but to fail in duty. Hence Cicero is not consistent with himself, for while he seemingly approves the sentiment of Euripides, yet, in reply to the objection of a supposed opponent, who says :†“But that ought not to be deemed valid which was done through fear,” he replies : “As if, indeed, a brave man could be forced.” It is true a man may be overcome by fear, especially through the application of violence, to take an oath which is contrary to his principles and wishes. But this is only admitting that he is an imperfect, sinful being, and in no way sanctifies the act so done more than the corrupt nature

* Hyppolytus 612. † De Off. III: 30.

which incites us to any wrong in opposition to the clear dictates of reason and virtue. So that it is undeniable that the inherent nature of the morality is not changed—only man becomes a sinner by temptation to forswear himself, just as he does in any other case.

It has been called in question whether an oath is admissible under the New Testament Dispensation, and the words of our Lord Jesus, "I say unto you, swear not at all," have been adduced in support of this view. Many respectable writers and some Christian sects have strenuously maintained that this excludes judicial swearing, and not merely profanity. But a closer examination of the Scripture doctrine on this subject teaches us that these words of the Saviour were uttered against those vain oaths so common among the Jews, such as swearing by the altar, by their heads, by other oaths; and among the heathen, the swearing by natural objects, such as Socrates' oath, by the dog, the caper bush, etc.; and Egyptians' oath by the cow; the Hindoos, by the Ganges; in a word, all those vain and blasphemous expressions so common among the heathen, as well as Christian people. But the conduct of the Lord and His apostles, show us plainly that judicial swearing could not be meant, since the Saviour himself did not refuse to answer when adjured by the High Priest; nor did the apostle Paul hesitate to take an oath voluntarily. But still, in this matter, we may be guilty of abuse, either in the mode, or in unnecessary frequency. For, on ordinary occasions, where there is little at stake, there is no need of the additional solemnity which an oath imposes. This being the most close and solemn of all obligations of which we are capable, it ought to be reserved for those occasions where inferior sanctity does not seem to comport with the magnitude of the cause at stake; since the constant employment in every instance may result in a contempt for the rite, as was well said by the wise man: * "Do not accustom thy mouth to the oath—he that sweareth continually shall not be free from sin." However, in theory, this case can present no difficulty, for it is undeniable that, † *abusus non tollit usum*; but in practice the matter is not without perplexity, since, as most moralists observe with pain, the frequency of administration and by improper persons, unquestionably has a tendency to bring the rite into contempt.

* Sirach XXIII: 9. † Tholuck Bergpredigt, p 363. Dritte Ausgabe.

When then is it right to take a judicial oath, and who has the proper authority to administer it? Doubtless as to the first—in every matter where it is deemed necessary to elicit the truth from those who will not declare it without the pressure of this additional security, or where a binding obligation is to be made to the State, which all must be left to the judgment of the Ruler. If any abuse arises from bad men having authority to administer, this is to be remedied in the legal way provided for obtaining better rulers; but as long as they are rightful masters we must obey, for the authority in the State is the representation of the Divine power on earth. We may think that we are required to take oaths when it is wholly unnecessary; but if, after protesting against the act, we are required by the constituted power to submit, and we faithfully perform the word which has gone forth from our mouth, then we are clear, and the sin lies at the door of him who needlessly imposes the rite upon us. Now, as to the authority itself which may impose it, we can have no difficulty; for if we do not recognize the power, all we have to do is to refuse, and take the consequence. It is impossible for any human tribunal to make us utter that which we steadfastly refuse; and while, in the preceding case, the sin lies with the imposer of the oath, if not properly done, in the latter we are the guilty party if we submit to that power which has no legal jurisdiction. Of this we must be the judges; but it will avail us nothing after we have taken the oath, then to plead in extenuation that the pretended ruler had no right over us, and therefore our obligation is not valid. For this ought to have been a forethought, not an afterthought; and hence there can be no excuse offered in justification. The unnecessary and unwarranted act lies with us, since we did it voluntarily, and no man's conscience but our own can be the measure of our duty.* Again: it is our duty to understand thoroughly the conditions of the oath which we take, and nothing but fraud on the part of the tenderer, and such fraud as rendered it impossible for us to discern, after that diligent examination the importance of the subject demands of a Christian, can excuse us for the negligence, or in any wise absolve us from the bonds we have taken upon ourselves. It is true that the temptation brought to bear may be so powerful that we can not resist, that the fear of death, the loss of reputation or

* Puffendorf, Lib. IV, Cap. II, § 5.

property, may render a man irrational; but it is contrary to common sense, and certainly to the Divine law, to say that he is not accountable. By a parity of reasoning, it could be said that whenever any man is tempted by his passions or interests to perpetrate a wicked act, contrary to his better judgment, that he is not accountable, because forsooth his inclination is so strong that his moral sense can not resist. Out on such folly, which would make the greatest criminal the most innocent sufferer, and the most hardened sinner the holiest saint! But what must be done when we are in the power of an enemy who desires to extort a promise from us, by the taking of which we may secure our life or liberty? One of two things is clear. We must either not take the oath which he wishes to impose on us, or if we do it must be kept at all hazards. If he has a right to compel us to an oath of secrecy, or to perform a service for him, then this is an end to the matter; we must abide by it. If he has no right to impose it, then we swear at our own peril whether we keep the oath or not. But, says one: * Suppose we fall into the hands of pirates, and they make us promise, under pain of death, to pay them a ransom; because they are the common enemies of mankind they have no right to demand this oath, since there is no community of law or feeling between them and the rest of the world. If they have no right to demand, then no man is innocent in granting their request; for there can not be an obligation merely on one side. But suppose you can save your life by this course, while otherwise you must die. While it is clear that a man is not justified in making a promise under oath to those who have no legal right to compel him; yet, if he avails himself of their clemency, while they fulfill their part of the contract, assuredly he must be faithful to his, and not prove himself less true than they have done. Any other course than this would have the tendency in future to prevent robbers, in similar instances, from sparing their captives; for, let it be remembered, they spare the lives of these persons simply on the ground of their faith in the inviolability of the oath, which, if not kept, takes away all hope of such clemency being repeated. But some one may say: If you pay a ransom to pirates or robbers who have held possession of you, then you uphold their nefarious work. This, however, is a consideration to be thought of

* Cic. De Off., Lib. III, XXIX.

before. If you do not wish to give aid to robbery, then it is your duty to not promise it; for it is certainly better to suffer what God permits to befall us, when in the clear performance of duty, than to save life by abrogating His commands. It manifests but little trust in Him to think we can deliver ourselves better through a course of positive transgression, than to throw ourselves wholly upon His special providence. Doubtless, persons have saved their lives by promising rewards to brigands, in whose hands they have fallen, and it is perhaps true that a contrary course will not always be followed by deliverance; but this only proves that God permits His own servants in this wicked world oftentimes to be overtaken by violence. But He who can bring light out of darkness, can, also, bring good out of evil; and it is better in doubtful matters to trust a faithful God, and suffer whatsoever may befall us, than to commit a positive sin to secure our personal deliverance. For nothing evil can befall a man but to commit sin; and life is not valuable when taken as the barter for transgression. Neither is death terrible to a brave man, nor otherwise than desirable when met in the way of duty.

Once more: Nothing can be more clear than that when an oath is taken in order to secure certain advantages, that it must also subject him who thus swears to all the disabilities naturally belonging thereto. Hence, after the advantages accruing have been enjoyed, as, for example, the protection of property, or personal security, afforded by a Government, this binds the person so protected to a cheerful and hearty submission to all the just claims a State may hold against him. Hence, then, no prevarication on his part, no mental reservations or implied conditions can, in the least, absolve any person from the performance of his obligations to the full extent they are involved by express stipulation or fair interpretation. For there are no conditions to be understood except those named: the promise is absolute; and therefore it follows further, that the imperfect fulfillment, on the part of the State, does not absolve the subject from his full allegiance. This is not a contract between two parties during pleasure or good behavior, so far as the individual is concerned; and hence the subject is bound on his side, even though his Government may not be inclined or able to meet completely all he hoped and expected. This truth is well expressed by Plato: If, therefore, the laws should say, O Socrates, was not this agreed upon between us and you,

that you would abide by the judgments which the city shall enact? . . . But when you were born, and nurtured, and educated, can you say first that you were not both our progeny and servant? And if this is so, have you equal rights with us, so that whatever we attempt to do to you, you consider yourself justified in endeavoring to do to us in turn? Or were your rights with reference to your father not the same as they were toward your master, if you chanced to have one, so that in case you suffered any thing, you should act in return alike in both instances, so as neither to retort, when reproached; nor when struck, to strike back; and many other similar cases? But, with reference to us, your laws and country, shall it be lawful to you, if we attempt to destroy you, thinking it to be just, that you also should endeavor, as far as in you lies, to destroy us in turn; and in doing this, will you assert that you act justly? . . . Still further, we proclaim by giving power to every Athenian who desires, when he has seen and tried the policy of the city, and us the laws, if he is not pleased with us, to go forth whithersoever he pleases, taking all his property with him; and no one of us, the laws, is in his way. But if he remains, after seeing what manner we dispense justice, and manage the city in other respects, we now assert that this man has, by his actions, declared that he will yield obedience to whatever we command him. *Crito*, Cap. XII, XIII.

Had the oath been taken with any such conditions as above named, then a man might be justified, when the State failed to protect him, or did a positive injustice, to withdraw from his obedience. But such is not the case, and where there is a positive duty on the one side, this is not effected by the misconduct of the other. Just as in our duties toward our fellow men we, as Christians, are bound just as much to do good to our enemies, as to our friends; and no conduct on the part of those who hate us changes, in the least, our duty to perform kind offices to them. The reason is, that the obligations are positive and unconditional, just as all morality is in truth; and whatever others may do to us, their acts do not change our duty to them.

It is clear, then, that no pecuniary consideration, or matter of personal aggrandizement, can absolve us from this fixed and complete obligation of fulfilling, in the letter and spirit, the promises we made in taking an oath. More especially if we have done this in order to secure such advantages; for, assuredly, if we obtain them

we will be less than men if we are not faithful on our part. But even if we have failed to secure that which we sought by this act, this in no wise changes our relations to duty. For, though this may have been our motive, yet we did not avow it as the inducement; nor would it have been accepted as a sufficient ground by the State, for no power would bind itself to an entirely one-sided obligation, giving all and getting nothing in return. However, oaths may often be taken with no higher aim than personal aggrandizement, it is still evident that more is implied; since, if there were nothing further expected, the individual wishes could never be sunk in the public good—an idea which lies at the foundation of the State itself. Accordingly, an oath rendered to the State is to be kept, no matter what misfortune or disability overtakes us in its fulfillment. Of course, all oaths taken simply in order to escape punishment, or to secure some advantage, but with the full determination to disregard them when the purpose for which they were sworn is attained, is downright perjury; no matter whether the power imposing them has a right to do so or not. And they have this especial turpitude that they are usually taken with deliberation, and ordinarily through no restraint of liberty or fear of impending danger. Nor does it improve the nature of the transaction when the power imposing is not one of competent jurisdiction; for we act as though we considered it to be valid, thus being guilty of two evils instead of one, by giving support, so far as our influence and example may go, to that which is unlawful; and at the same time being chargeable with profanity by swearing before a tribunal that our conscience does not approve as of Divine authority.

But it may be further asked: Is an oath to be kept when it has been wrested from us under false or suppressed conditions? that is, when another, either an individual or a State, has taken advantage of us by concealment of the truth, and thus caused us to bind our honor to measures which, had we thoroughly understood, we would not have given our pledge.* This matter, though much complicated by writers on morals, seems yet clear and simple in its true nature. For it is our privilege, as well as duty, to become informed fully of the nature of that to which we subject ourselves; and we show little regard for virtue or our own best

* Puffendorf, Lib. IV, Cap. III, § 7.

interests, if we allow any person to beguile into an appeal to God to enable us to perform a specified act, and make Him a witness to an assertion about which we do not fully know. Before we thus bind our consciences, we have the opportunity to know the truth; or, in default of this, can refuse to be sworn until perfectly satisfied. And when that state of mind is arrived at, then the responsibility is shifted upon us, and we can not escape by pleading want of information. But it is true we may be deceived by false representations, even after the most diligent efforts to avoid it, and be led to swear to that which nothing could induce us with the full facts before us. In such cases the sin lies not on us, but on him who administered the oath with intent to deceive. However, the question arises, are we still bound to keep our pledge? Undoubtedly, unless we have unwittingly promised something which it would be sinful to perform. If the fulfillment of our oath only involves our own personal disability, we must nevertheless keep it; for it is the distinct characteristic of the good man that * "he sweareth to his hurt and changeth not;" and the declaration of God is, that "he who doeth these things shall never be moved;" by which we have the assurance that the man who persistently casts himself upon the protection of Almighty God, and does not let personal interest or inclination interfere with his obedience, will always receive the Divine blessing. It is certainly true that duty must come before all interests, and if there is any thing established in all the domain of morality and truth which is an absolute duty, it is when we have pledged our honor to man and our belief and hopes in God. Hence, unless there can be something in the way of private interest or personal comfort, of higher importance than the stake of our moral nature, and our obedience to our Maker, we must perform our oath, even when it has been obtained from us by false representations. If it be said that we swear, not to the thing which we now find to be demanded, but to something else, it must be insisted that our oath is a matter of positive and unconditional obligation, except such conditions as are expressed at the time; and if we feared any such consequences as may become manifest afterward, from the falsity of him who tendered the oath, then was the time for us to have considered this, and made provision for such contingencies, either by refu-

sing the oath, or expressed it in such terms as gave us room for escape.

But in the case where a man has subscribed to an oath inadvertently to do something wrong in itself, or from change of circumstances that which we promised becomes sinful, the case is undoubtedly altered. No one sin can, in the nature of things, ever neutralize another, and two wrongs can never make one right act. Hence, when we are brought to this extremity, the most desperate that a truly conscientious man can be reduced, there is no alternative but to refuse to do that which was promised. The apothegm, *minima de malis*, may be applied here properly; and certainly it is a less evil to refuse to do a wicked act, even when we are under oath to do so, than to keep our vow. For it is plain that the act of swearing to do a given thing which is evil, makes it none the less evil; but is in itself a sin of the most heinous character, if done consciously; yet may be only a sin of ignorance, if done inadvertently; and it is only adding to the wickedness to persevere in that which is known to be wrong. But in order to justify the falsification of our oath in such cases, the instance must be clear in all its bearings. First: That we did not and could not possibly foresee that we were pledging ourselves to do that which was wicked. And, secondly: We must be perfectly certain that our non-performance of the oath results from a virtuous desire to avoid doing a wicked act, and not from the hope of any personal aggrandizement which may result from our failure. For if the latter be the ruling motive, we have the double guilt of perjury and hypocrisy; screening ourselves behind an apparently virtuous motive to avoid doing that which is wrong, while, so far as the sin of false swearing itself is concerned, it does not enter as an element into our conduct.

II. In the consideration of this subject in the concrete application, we find the most common instances of false swearing to be where men in concert disregard their obligations of allegiance to the State. The preceding disquisitions on the nature and obligations of an oath were necessary as a basis from which to advert on the monstrous ideas of immorality which obtain among those who justify or participate in the present insurrection, by which a large section of our people have proven false to their sworn allegiance; and yet pretend they have committed no crime, and claim to be immaculate in their honor. It is now the purpose

to show that, as there was no justification for such a course, so those who have proven recreant to their sworn obligations, have justly incurred the charge of perjury; and therefore deserve the contempt and loathing of every high principled and virtuous person.

As said in the beginning, when treating of the nature of an oath, it is undeniable that implied truthfulness is the condition on which human society is possible. For if it was generally understood that the communications between man and man could not be relied on, then it evidently follows that there could be no union for concerted action; and hence the elements of civil society would be utterly repellant, and no combination for government possible. The highest expression of this confidence, on which the fabric of society rests, is the promise of obedience to authority, and the support necessary to sustain the ruler given by the powers of the individual. For the power of the ruler can not be any thing else than the aggregation of the strength of each citizen, which is promised for mutual support and defense. Hence, governments are the expression of the sum total of the individual power surrendered for the common good; and in this surrender the acknowledgment is tacitly made that the sway is to be exercised by the representative, because he can do this better than the multitude; and this must, therefore, be done not precisely in the way to please each person in every particular, but in such manner as best to conserve the public good. The wishes of each one are to be considered in the aggregate, and are to be met as far as this can be done consistently with the greatest good to the greatest number. Such is the idea lying at the foundation of all representative governments; and especially is the exemplar after which our democratic institutions are formed; and is also the result after which every good ruler must strive. It can not be pretended that, in an imperfect state of society, with the best intentions, failure in part will not constantly occur, and individual wrongs be suffered, even while, on the whole, the Government accomplishes its true end and aim. From this it follows that secession strikes at the very root of all government; and, if carried out to its legitimate results, reduces men at once to the condition of society which Deistic philosophers term a state of nature, where every man's hand is against that of his fellow. For, while the State is built up on the supposition that the minority, that is of the single person or any number less than half, must surrender

his preferences for the good of the greater number, secession takes precisely the opposite course. For if any less than the greater number can refuse obedience at such times as they think themselves aggrieved, and separate from the body politic, so also can less than half of that fraction again, for the same reason, slough off; and the process becomes complete, producing its final result, when the last analysis leaves the individual. For if the theory of secession be admissible at all, it must be granted thus far; since there is no other point at which we can stop. Each successive step is as allowable as every preceding one which comprehends less than a numerical majority, in a State where the democratic principle is complete. Hence it also follows that revolution in a free government is not allowable at all, for the majority which must rule has the power of amendment in their own hands, and the minority is bound by the terms of the social compact to submit. The justification which is allowed to those who, in a despotic or monarchical form of government, break their oath of allegiance, does not obtain here, because the remedy for the evils of legislation is in the hands of the people, and its method of application provided for without resort to arms or the violation of any compact. So much has been said as to the destructive nature of the principle of secession, when applied to government in general. But our chief business is to show how it has effected the great vinculum of society, the oath of allegiance, in our present insurrection.

While it would be impossible, perhaps, to give an exhaustive enumeration of the various particulars in which the leaders of secession and their sympathizers have committed perjury, it will be sufficient, to make the case out against them, to state a few of those which are well authenticated and have been oft repeated. The first of these is in the original movement which brought on our present dire calamities. It is scarcely pretended by any fair man now, or was previous to open insurrection, that there was any adequate ground for separation, either for constitutional reasons, or fear that the Government would abuse its trusts. While individual acts of unfriendliness could often be pointed out, wherein the South had cause of complaint, yet this is no more than must occur in any system of government short of perfection. But the Federal powers were not responsible for them, because it is undeniable that from the first of our nation's history, it was in the hands of those very men who were disposed to clamor at the inva-

sion of their rights. If they were actually invaded, which no man can say truthfully, and which leading secessionists have not dared to give as the reason for their conduct, (at least when dealing with foreign governments,) there was a perfectly satisfactory way to remedy them; for these complainants had the law in their own hands, and the officers to administer it. Nothing but a peculiar privilege, ever distasteful to the great majority, a privilege resting on sufferance, and not on the moral approval of the people, was endangered, and this in no specific way, but by the increasing unfriendliness of the majority; and hence the apprehension created that the time would come when the nation would outgrow an inherited disease, which it was not vigorous enough in its swaddling clothes to shake off. But if this was done, in other words, if the great body of the people should finally deem themselves strong enough physically, and sufficiently noble intellectually and morally, to keep pace with the general progress of Christian civilization, and eradicate the plague of slavery from its vitals, surely no one ought for a moment to deny them the right. And this is all that can be adduced in justification for breaking all the bonds of union; for annulling every obligation of obedience which holds a State together; for perpetrating the most shocking perjury that ever disgraced a people. It is not pretended to be maintained that the oath of allegiance is of perpetual obligation, when the government to which it was given has ceased to conserve the liberties of the people. Undoubtedly there may be instances where the citizens are not bound to continue submission; for the power which they have surrendered to the ruler is a trust, and this, when unmistakably and grossly abused, can, and ought to be, taken back; because it no longer accomplishes the object intended. The majority of the people are still the power, and in their keeping is ultimately the right to govern; and the oath they have taken is therefore to themselves, as represented in the person of their Magistrate—to themselves and for their own behoof—and therefore, when their representative is unfaithful, upon him rests the sin of violated allegiance. He has failed in his part of the compact; he has placed himself beyond the sphere of mutual obligation, and the people are guiltless. But the decision as to whether this has occurred must not rest with a disaffected minority, else no representative government would be possible. But no honest man will, for a moment, pretend that such was the case when the

secession movement was inaugurated. On the contrary, it is well known that the great majority of the people in the present disloyal States, to say nothing of all the rest, were bitterly opposed to secession; and it was only by the most barefaced falsehoods and inflammatory appeals, by illegal elections, and by unwarranted legislative action, that even the semblance of consent was wrested from an unwilling people. So that it is undeniable that a condition justifying rebellion did not exist, and indeed could not under our form of government; that the annulling of allegiance was unwarranted; and therefore the movement of secession, at its outset, was perjury. Nay, more. In its first motions among the fire-eaters and nullifiers, for years back, the same disintegrating and destructive measures were advocated; so that it may be truly said that secession was conceived, brought forth and swaddled in perjury; that the first cry it uttered was the abrogation of a solemn oath, and as the monster grew up, the speech which it invented and made its own was the language of false swearing.

But to be more specific. The leaders of the insurrectionary movement were nearly all officers under the United States Government, and as such were bound to support it until, in the estimation of the majority of the people, it became false to its trusts and tyrannical in its sway. Still more: They had been educated in its institutions, grew rich under its protection, and battered on the spoils of its offices. They had received all the advantages which its highest honors could give; had enjoyed all its blessings; but now that they come under the uneasy yoke of its restraints, they shake off their obligation with the readiness of the lion who finds himself annoyed with the spider's net. Verily they turn against the mother that bore them, and lift the paricidal hand to stab the bosom that nourished them into manhood. While prating of the encroachments on their rights as a justification for their course, they wholly ignore the fact that neither specific nor general act on the part of the Government inimical to them can be adduced; and if there was unfriendly legislation by any of the States, the remedy was open to them in one of two ways: Either by the ordinary channels of legislation in their own reach, as they possessed the majority in both houses of Congress—always including the servile dough-faces, who were constantly led at their bidding. For by this means they could have wielded the powers of the Federal Government for the accomplishment of their own

views; or at least made them powerless for harm, had any attempts been made to interfere with their special municipal privileges. So that, forsaking the legal method entirely in their own power of preventing or redressing wrongs, they choose rather that which is revolutionary, and forswear their allegiance, thus proving false to themselves and the people whose rights, if invaded, they were bound to protect. But there was another method provided by which the people, if dissatisfied, could seek redress, that is, by separation; not secession, but separation provided for by the Constitution of our Government. The same numerical majority necessary to ratify the articles of confederation at its beginning, could also peacefully break up this bond of union, and thus take back the powers and allegiance delegated to the Federal Government. This would have saved the authors of the insurrection the crime of perjury, provided such numerical majority could have been obtained in convention; but until this was done, any other method of withdrawing from the Union was both rebellion and perjury.

There is another aspect in which the perjury of the leaders and abettors of the insurrection appears still more flagrant. It is that they continued to hold office, which implies, of course, the oath of allegiance continually binding, to receive emoluments, and to wield all the power they could command to the destruction of the Government they were sworn to protect. While notoriously and avowedly in concert with the enemies at home, even after the inauguration of civil war, they held on to their places in Washington, often with the advice of their constituents at home, as traitors in the camp; because they could do so much more there than enemies in the field. Mr. Breckinridge is a very noteworthy example of this. For he continued to sit in the United States Senate, where, as a spy, he could get all the information as to the policy and movements of the Federal Government, and by conveying this to his fellow-traitors at home, could thwart and render utterly abortive every measure taken for the common safety. Doubtless, it would be far more agreeable to him to be there still, receiving a senator's pay and keeping out of harm's way, as well as profitable to his cause, which he has ceased to aid ever since he left the position of an enemy in the camp. Nor is this all. Under the guise of loyalty, traitors have swarmed in every department at Washington; for it is well known that evermore in the division of the loaves and fishes, the South has represented, with

even more accuracy than the penurious Yankees, the daughters of the horse-leech; and while easy enough for them to secede and play false to every trust, it was difficult to the refined sense of Southern chivalry to yield the dug which it had sucked so vigorously ever since it had a being. Yet these were all honorable men, ready to fly in the face of any one who called in question their nice sense of honor; ready to take the blood of any adversary who was so thoughtless as to call their conduct by its right name—more especially if too weak for him in argument, or they could fall upon him unarmed and in a posture incapable for self-defense.

It is a strange weakness of our nature that we usually try to claim those virtues which we most notoriously, in the estimation of others, do not possess, and the lack of which we ourselves are most deeply conscious. There is nothing, not even the Mayflower and Plymouth Rock, which has been repeated so thoroughly *ad nauseam* to the maw of the public, as the high honor, the unsullied gentlemanly character, the superior civilization and refinement of the Southern-bred cavalier. The whole catalogue of high-toned characteristics were claimed as constituent parts of their complacent virtue; and, as if they had received more than their share, there appeared, in their estimation, to be none left for those unfortunates who had the bad luck to be born north of Mason and Dixon's line. These boasts became the stock in trade of their conversation when visitors were present; they were made the web and woof of their literature; were the lesson of the school-book, and the text of the editorial leader; composed the brief of the lawyer, and the substance of the Judge's charge, especially when some wretch from the North was taken up for using freedom of speech; and finally cropped out in the self-laudatory effusions of the pulpit. So that at the very time when most guilty of the sum of all that is base, when destitute of that without which there can be no honor—truthfulness—these extravagant claims were made, and by those who were especially representative men in this guilt.

Such is the Upas tree which has grown up as the choice plant of secession. Let us note some of the fruits produced among its branches. When war exists among civilized nations, certain regulations are observed as necessary to mitigate the horrors and curb the wild passions of men so prone in their own nature to exceed all bounds. Among these usages is the parole of prisoners,

who, by that merciful act, are restored to their homes and friends, and therefore delivered from the necessary rigors of military prisons, and the sickness which accompanies the close confinement of many men together. As an act of mercy, this has been again and again extended to large bodies of rebel prisoners through a reliance that the secessionists, being of the same common stock with ourselves, had not quite lost those principles of honor which belong to Christian people. But in every case where this has been done, to any considerable extent, those very paroled prisoners are found immediately in arms again. Multitudes of those captured at Vicksburg were retaken at Chickamauga and Chattanooga. Having totally disregarded the solemn oath of non-combatants, straightway, as soon as they can be removed to another scene of hostilities, they are found swelling the ranks of the enemy again to meet the Union forces in battle, even those who had spared them. Now if this had occurred only in a few examples, if the proof of its having occurred at all was doubtful, then little stress could be laid on what were but isolated or ill-authenticated instances. But when sufficient numbers have been taken to enable us to judge by comparison, that a large proportion of all those once paroled are immediately, and without exchange, in arms again; and when we find the rebel press and government not only conniving at, but upholding this iniquity, the evil becomes one of colossal magnitude, and shows that the corruption of perjury is so deep-seated as to have diseased the whole body politic. If the return to arms was voluntary, this shows how much public sentiment was debauched. But if they were forced by the Richmond junta, we have, if possible, a greater display of wicked arrogance than aught before exhibited. For the right to force men who are under parole to fight again, can only follow from the right to absolve them from their oath. Perhaps Jeff. Davis, in the plenitude of his usurped powers, has, also, in the estimation of his abject minions, that authority claimed by the Pope, who, "as Vicar of Jesus Christ, and superior to all Christians, can, having a good motive for it, annul by his power and release immediately from every obligation contracted in the strength of a promise made under the faith of an oath." * This, however, would be only in keeping with the ordinary Jesuitical morality of the secessionists, who hold it

* Father Lessius, *De Justitia et Jure*, p 632.

perfectly justifiable to take any oath the Federal Government may impose with a view of saving their persons or property, yet with the mental reservation not to keep it. The faithlessness in regard to paroled prisoners is worse than any case of failure to keep an oath could be in times of peace; for the few conventions recognized during hostilities are so necessary to check the tendency to barbarism, that if these be disregarded nothing remains to stay the current of violence. So when we look at this conduct as the result of deliberate advice on the part of the insurrection leaders, it shows a depth of depravity; an utter contempt of the sacred nature of an oath, which leaves no remaining foundation for moral renovation.

Kindred to this is the course almost universally pursued by those enemies within the Federal lines, who have taken the non-combatant's oath to escape punishment for their previous treasonable conduct. The oath administered in such cases is formed with the closest attention to accuracy, so as to exclude every form of prevarication; and accordingly it is impossible for any man to take this oath truthfully and subsequently engage in any hostile acts, either directly or indirectly. Yet it has become notorious that this oath, in nine cases out of ten, is not regarded in any other light than that of a disguise by which an enemy can conceal his designs, and more effectually operate against the Federal cause by being in a position to obtain and convey information to the rebels in arms. And when a force of the enemy arrives, sufficient to strike a blow, these same honorable non-combatants are found the most zealous in punishing such as had lately been their protectors. Nor do they hesitate to form guerrilla bands to plunder and murder their own neighbors; but the moment a Federal force, sufficient to fight them, arrives, then instantly they are citizens again, following the arts of peace. Every person who has had the misfortune to be found in a section of country temporarily held by the invading enemy, has seen abundant instances of the zeal of non-combatants to punish the friends of the Union; to point them out to their foes, and secure the destruction of their substance. It is evident that human villainy can go no further, yet these same persons, when the surging tide of war moves backward again, are found flocking to the offices of Provost Marshals to renew their oath of faithful neutrality; and, too often, alas! find officers weak enough to trust them. And thus they repeat

the farce of swearing only to falsify it in practice the first occasion that offers. It is a conclusion which was long resisted, and finally accepted with extreme pain, that, almost without exception, secessionists and their sympathizers do not, in the least, regard an oath taken to the Government. Whether this horrid wickedness in this matter is consistent with truthfulness and honor in other respects, it is not the purpose now to discuss. Suffice it to say that, after an extensive acquaintance with those who have participated in the insurrection, and afterward claimed Federal protection, only a single example has ever come to our knowledge where the oath has been faithfully observed. It can not be said, in extenuation, that the Federal authority is not binding on the consciences of those who pretend to submit to it; for the very act of claiming its protection, and of promising entire abstinence from direct or indirect movements against it, is an acknowledgment of its jurisdiction. No force, moreover, is employed to make them take the oath. This act is entirely voluntary, for whosoever does not wish to bind himself to desist from aiding the enemies of our country, has the very easy, and it would seem, joyful, alternative of leaving the brutal and degraded Yankees, the barbarous and uncivilized hordes of the North, and fleeing to the refinement, the purity, the blessedness, to be found in the embraces of the high-toned chivalry of the sunny South. It would certainly be more patriotic in secession sympathizers, if they are contending for a principle, to go with the cause they pretend to love for its own sake. What if they did leave their property? They set out on principle, contrary to the course of the Union defenders, who fight for gain alone; and now shall it be said they are afraid to fight for their cause, or that they love the detestable government at Washington better than the man of their choice at Richmond? Surely this is the time for the exhibition of boasted principle, and for the bundle of virtues composing a secession gentleman to shine out in their original luster. And truly no friend of the Union could object if these non-combatant sympathizers should depart, like Judas, to their place; for it is notorious that each one of these sworn neutrals, who is a traitor at heart, while under the strictest bonds, is more dangerous than an enemy in the field, and gives the Federal authorities more trouble in seeking protection, or clamoring for pay in the case of real or fancied losses, than a dozen true and faithful patriots. Moreover, we see the champions

of chivalry forsaking the cause and taking refuge under the flag which they once reviled and abused with all their heart. Cowardly poltroons ! having neither the courage to fight, nor the manliness to meet the issues of the horrid war they have aided in lighting up, they fly to a neutral power, and chose to preserve their valuable lives by smelling the battle emphatically afar off. From their retreat, where they have slunk away from manly warfare, and can not be reached by the punishment of the civil law for their treasonable conduct, they continue to spue out their impotent wrath on all who do not think honor and patriotism consist in perjury and insurrection. While uttering every vile charge against the Federal Government and its supporters, they seem to forget that they have left their wives, their children and property under the guardianship of those they revile. Nor does it occur to them that, while their families and property enjoy the Federal protection, by their own advice and consent, they, by this fact, owe allegiance to the Government, and acknowledge that it has more honor than they have ; since it indirectly protects them while they exert their utmost to destroy it. Yet these same cowardly vagabonds, in a venal press, both foreign and domestic, continue to send forth their periodical diatribes concerning *Christian manliness*, and at the same time scandalize decent ears by their slang, which is intended for wit. We have dissertations on *New England ignorance* from those who learned what little they know there. Every minister of the Gospel who thinks and speaks as if he considered obedience to the powers that be a Christian virtue, is taken to task for Erastianism, for the unholy converse between Church and State ; unless forsooth his utterances are on the side of a treasonable and perjured insurrection, when, of course, the union between a schismatic Church and a seceded State is holy, and the offspring legitimate.

Thus we see the general sentiment prevailing among all the enemies of our country that no oath is binding when taken to support it. But upon what is this opinion founded ? Is it that the United States, which they once acknowledged, and which still has all that constitutes a power, is not an organized Government ? Certainly once they, by their own admission, owed and rendered obedience ; and if this was proper then, it must continue to be so still, for the Government itself has never done any thing to destroy its right to exercise legislative sway. It performed all that a State

was required to do; gave protection to all rights and punished evil-doers. There being no justifying cause on the part of the Federal authorities for all this horrid work, it follows that it still possesses the legitimate sway over all its subjects, which includes all and singular of the inhabitants of the United States—as well those who are in hostility as those in loyal obedience. Hence it follows that the former are continually guilty of perjury for not doing those acts of fealty which are of perpetually binding obligation. The fact that any one, by factious opposition, chooses to think that he owes no allegiance to a State, does not make this true; neither does it excuse his conduct, nor free him from the condemnation awaiting those who resist the ordinance of God. But the proof to show that the people of the South do owe allegiance, is corroborated by their own conduct. For, in nearly all instances where our victorious arms have penetrated, the people, as soon as the might is displayed, acknowledge the right (which, of course, they would not do, if it did not exist, as they are fighting for their rights), sufficiently to subscribe to the oath, in order to secure protection in person or property. This is a tacit acknowledgment, and throws the burden of allegiance back on him who subscribes to the oath. For if the Government has no right to enforce its obligations, then, as before shown, it is wicked for a man to submit to them; and the decision must be made before the duty is assumed. But high-toned Southern gentlemen would not, of course, do any thing wicked, least of all swear falsely. The character of the power must be considered before we subscribe to it, else we, and not the State, must bear the sin of false swearing; and hence the duty is equally imperative, whether we consider the Government valid or not, provided we are in the possession of all the facts.

But for what is the oath taken, if not to secure some advantage? and when that is obtained, surely it is not in the province of morality to shake off the restraints which accompany such benefits. The one presupposes the other, and if the one be obtained the other must be assumed. But the mind of the traitor is so thoroughly perverted, that he thinks it perfectly consistent with his morality—and so it is—to take advantage of the oath for committing, with impunity, those acts for which he must otherwise be outlawed as an enemy, and banished as an alien. It is often asserted by the very pinks of honor, even by those who term themselves ladies, that the oath to the Federal Government has no

binding force, and therefore can be taken to secure advantages, and broken with impunity. But aside from this monstrous blasphemy, which out-Herods the casuistry of the Jesuits, and exhibits a phase of degradation, which, we believe, and trust for the honor of our common humanity, was never before known, there is one element which gives the oath its validity and which insures the Divine punishment for perjury, which is entirely overlooked by them. When we swear, it is not to man merely, but to the Lord; and therefore we are pledged under the invocation of the Divine blessing on obedience, and the imprecation of the curse of God if we fail; and no consideration respecting the earthly power can avail to change the nature of this absolute obligation of faithfulness. And let it also be noted that when men swear in order to secure advantages, and when these are obtained they do not intend to be faithful to their vows, it is manifest that they prefer them to the blessings which God bestows upon those who swear and change not; and dread more the earthly disabilities which they shun, than the wrath of the Almighty which they imprecate. So glaring is this open blasphemy, for it can be nothing else, that it is talked of as a good joke to take the Federal oath, ("to swallow the mule," in the neat and elegant phraseology of refined secession ladies,) and take advantage of the credulity of Government officials; and nothing seems to be further from the intention than to keep such oath, unless that there be any binding force upon the conscience to keep it sacred.

In conclusion, it is held that, if the blessing of the Most High rests upon that people or man who honors his name by faithful oaths, "who sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not," surely, also, the curse of God will follow whosoever is guilty of the horrid blasphemy which has been pointed out in the foregoing pages. And if this be the greatest sin of which a man can be guilty; if this prostrates his whole moral nature, as well as dishonors the blessed name of God, then surely must the secession movement be of colossal wickedness. For the public conscience seems to be thoroughly depraved, and this iniquity to sweep over those in insurrection like a flood. Nor is it confined to the enemy in arms. It is found wherever this insurrection has friends, either among those who give their substance to destroy our Government, or who, by their position, their animus, or their words, give moral support to the common enemy. It is not enough that we lift no hand

against the State we have sworn to protect, nor that we do not equip and send our sons or others to fight. We may, by unfaithfulness to our Government in this hour of its trial, do far more than the soldier in the field who kills our men. Our influence may weaken the common cause of our nation, and prolong the struggle for the destruction of the enemy, and thus jeopard our fealty to the State which shelters us. The outward formal obedience is not enough to make the oath of allegiance inviolate. We must be true in heart, as well as faithful in action, if we would acquit ourselves of duty. For this is what we bound ourselves to do when, by appealing to the witness of God for the rectitude of our purposes, we promised to be faithful to the power which He has delegated to man, and which is swayed by the Magistrate, who is the visible representative of that authority on earth.

ART. V.—*The Men of Danville.* No. 2.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE REV. DAVID RICE.*

THE first of the Men of Danville—the founder of the Church in this place—the founder of the first School taught in Kentucky—the seed of all the Presbyterian institutions of the State, and the founder and father of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, was the Rev. David Rice, to whose biography we propose to devote this paper. He deserves a fuller and more extended notice than he has yet received. His memory ought to be revived; it has almost faded from the recollection of the present generation, though a few remember the name, and still fewer the person of the venerable “Father Rice,” as he was universally called. He was not only the founder of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, but for long years its guide and counselor “in perils in the wilderness, and in perils among false brethren.” It may be safely said, that the character of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky down

* An outline of the History of the Church in the State of Kentucky, by Robert H. Bishop—History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky, by Rev. Robert Davidson, D. D.—Annals of the American Pulpit, by Wm. B. Sprague, D. D.—Collins’ History of Kentucky.

to the present time, is, in large part, a reflex of his character—distinguished for firmness, wisdom and moderation. The State at large owes also much to his labors. He was the founder, as already stated, of the first seminary of learning in Kentucky, which led to the establishment of Transylvania University, and subsequently to that of Centre College, and thus to the diffusion of much of the learning and intelligence which have illuminated the State and the neighboring sister States, which have, in part, sprung from her, and received largely the impress of their characters from Kentucky. While in Virginia he had taken an active part in the establishment of Hampden Sydney College, and had an important agency in obtaining its first two Presidents—the Rev. Samuel Stanhope Smith and the Rev. John Blair Smith.

David Rice was born in Hanover County, Va., Dec. 20, 1788. His grandfather, who was an Englishman by birth, of Welsh extraction, immigrated to Virginia at an early period. Having had a considerable estate left him in England, he crossed the ocean with a view to obtain it, but never returned; and it was supposed he was assassinated on board the ship on which he took passage. He left in Virginia a large family of children, one of whom, David, was the father of the subject of this notice. He was a plain farmer, and both he and his wife were members of the Established Church. *They would never own slaves; he, because he considered it unprofitable; she, because she considered it morally wrong*—thus embracing, in their combined sentiments, the two fundamental grounds upon which the opposition to this institution is founded: First, it is wrong; secondly, it is unprofitable. It is worthy of the profoundest notice, that the principles of this good couple of the olden time, old-fashioned and old-principled people, on the subject of Slavery, should be transmitted through their son to the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, and, more or less, to the people of the State generally to the present day. It will be seen, that David Rice introduced, even into the first convention of Kentucky for the formation of a State Constitution, a provision for the removal of this institution; and from him has descended and remained in the bosom of the Church, at all times, a deep sense of its evils, moral, economical, and political, and been thence diffused, to no small degree, through the whole community.

David had religious impressions from an early period; he passed through many struggles and phases of feeling, with which only

those who have had similar experiences can fully sympathize—struggles and sorrows to which nothing earthly can compare in the intensity of their agony, which issued in his thorough and genuine conversion to Christ. He lived in a congregation under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Todd; but he was particularly benefited by a sermon which he heard of the Rev. Samuel Davies, and soon afterward united with the Church under Mr. Todd. Mental distresses, through which young Rice passed, are not unfrequently the effect of mistaken notions. This was in part his case. He says, speaking of himself, "this turned my play into prayer, which I practiced from one to seven times a day; yet all this prayer and all this seriousness, I afterward found, proceeded from no higher principle than self-love. The avoiding of misery and the obtaining of happiness, were the sum of my motives." Does the Bible present to us any higher motives than these? Are not life and death set before us in the Scriptures as the great motives of action? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," are the very words of the Saviour himself, given to His disciples just before His ascension to the throne of His Father, and enjoined to be proclaimed to all mankind, even to the end of the world. How unnecessarily, therefore, did this good man condemn himself for self-love, in his desire to escape death and obtain life—the great prize presented to our view and efforts in the Scriptures—and because he could not find in his heart some sublimated notions and sentiments of devotion in which self-salvation and happiness were excluded, and the high and disinterested glory of God was the supreme and only impulse of feeling and action. We doubt if Mr. Rice ever subsequently professed to attain to any such utter annihilation of self-regard through his long career of piety and usefulness. He soon determined to devote his life to the gospel ministry. He determined to sacrifice every inclination and every interest which would impede him in the pursuit of the necessary qualifications. One of his resolutions we desire to bring before the attention of modern students of Divinity, and of young men who have the ministry in view. He particularly resolved to avoid every degree of social intimacy with the other sex, knowing that entering into the marriage state would impede, if not entirely prevent the accomplishment of his object. Many young men of this day might profit by the adoption of this resolution; who, if they

are not actually entangled in the marriage relation, waste much of their precious time in young female society, and expose themselves to the temptation of premature marriage. When the proper time arrives, marriage is, as a general thing, the duty of the young minister; but it is still more his duty to abstain from it till that proper time comes.

Young Rice commenced his classical studies under Mr. Todd, and continued them under the Rev. James Waddel, D. D. Mr. Davies having been appointed President of the College of New Jersey, Mr. Rice accompanied him thither in 1759, and entered the Junior class. Having taken the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1761, he returned to Virginia, and studied Theology under the Rev. John Todd, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Hanover in November, 1762. He had then nearly completed his twenty-ninth year. The first field of his evangelical labors was the southern part of Virginia and the northern part of North Carolina. After laboring here, not without some evidence of success, for about six months, he visited Pennsylvania, where he married Mary, the daughter of the Rev. Samuel Blair. Thence he returned to Virginia, with the purpose of settling in North Carolina; but, stopping at Hanover, then vacant by the removal of Mr. Davies, he received a call to settle there, and, having accepted it, was ordained and installed in December, 1763.

Here he labored four or five years, with considerable success, though his own impression was that his ministry accomplished more for the blacks than the whites. This feature in his ministry, or rather the great importance of increased attention to the spiritual wants of this portion of our population, we design, subsequently, to bring to the especial notice of our readers, and we earnestly desire to commend it to the notice of all preachers of the gospel, old and young. The minister of the gospel in the slave States who neglects the black population, will have a fearful account to give to his Master. It was to the poor he was sent to preach the gospel. An old dispute between two of his principal elders, which originated in the time of Mr. Davies, having been revived—in consequence of which the congregation was likely to be embarrassed, in respect to his support—he obtained from the Presbytery a dissolution of his pastoral relation. He hated contention, was subject to depression of spirits, and was often fearful of the worst;

and this, probably, had much to do with his determination to seek another field of labor. The separation from his charge was a painful event both to him and to them, for they were mutually and warmly attached.

During this period of distress and privation, he found a true help-mate in his excellent wife. Mrs. Rice was a woman of uncommon strength of mind and piety, and brought to his aid her vigorous and efficient exertions. She literally sought out wool and flax and wrought vigorously with her hands. To her economy and prudence, and cheerful and pious temper, the comfort and success of the long and useful life of Father Rice are, in a great measure, to be attributed. We are informed that, on the Sabbath, when her husband was absent, a portion of the day was spent in catechizing her children and *servants*, and in prayer with them. As we have assumed the responsibility of advising young men, devoting themselves to the ministry, when to marry, we will now go a step further, and offer them a word of advice as to whom to marry. Let their first object in seeking a wife be piety, directed by sound sense and accompanied by industry and energy of character, and let them sedulously avoid young women who have little else to recommend them besides the possession of fashionable accomplishments. One woman of the character of Mrs. Rice is worth half a dozen superficially educated modern belles, with the smallest modicum of Latin and French, and years wasted on fashionable music. Such women become, instead of help-mates, only burdens and impediments to the minister. Let him especially avoid becoming a fortune-seeker. We have seldom seen a preacher, who married a fortune, whose character and usefulness were not seriously impaired by it. *

* The education of girls at the present time is like the play of Hamlet, with the part of Hamlet left out. Great attention is paid to their mental and ornamental education, but none whatever to their industrial, domestic and corporeal. The true maxim of education is, *Mens sana in corpore sano*. Without health, feeble and effeminate, without habits of industry or knowledge of domestic duties, a woman, however highly educated intellectually, and whatever may be her other accomplishments, who has been neglected in the most important part of her education, is wholly unfit to fulfill the duties for which God designed her. She will not live out half her days—she may pass a short, gay and brilliant life, but it will be a useless one.

We have just conversed with a lady of intelligence, who mourned the loss of the health of two interesting daughters, who had received the most accomplished education which one of the first schools in the United States could impart; but,

After giving up his charge, Mr. Rice remained for two or three years unsettled, though he was, during that period, employed in his Master's work as opportunity offered. At length he determined to settle himself in Bedford County, Va., a new and frontier settlement, in a mountainous region, with a population drawn from various parts of the world, and representing nearly all the various religious denominations. Here he took charge of three congregations, one of which was five, another eleven, and another twenty-five miles from his dwelling. The last mentioned was called "the Peaks," being near the Peaks of Otter. Here his labors were greatly blessed, and without any extraordinary excitement. There was a lively and healthful state of religious feeling, and an earnest attention to the preaching of the Word, which lasted, without any perceptible decline, for ten years. All classes and denominations were fond of attending his ministry. In due time this congregation became sufficiently numerous to require all his labors, and accordingly he gave up the others and confined his attention to this. His ministry here was during the war of the Revolution, when many other congregations were scattered and separated from their pastors. It was much to the praise of the people that, during this disastrous period, they fulfilled their pecuniary engagements to him with punctuality.

To make some provision for his rising family, Mr. Rice was induced to make a visit to Kentucky. He had received glowing accounts of the fertility of the lands, which might be obtained for little more than the cost of entry. His object was not to preach, nor to make a settlement himself soon, if ever, but if all the circumstances should be favorable, to procure settlements for his numerous family. He was charmed with the country, but neither the mode appointed by the Legislature for taking up land, nor the character of the settlers generally, pleased him. While in Kentucky he preached as opportunity offered. On his return he met with four thousand emigrants to this new and beautiful country. Soon after his return, he received a verbal invitation to return to

alas! at the expense of health. One of them has been, for several years, an invalid. She mourned and denounced the course she had pursued. Let parents, ambitious of affording to their daughters "a splendid education," take care that health be not sacrificed, and industrial and domestic habits be not neglected. A wife without these qualifications is no help-mate; but, finally, becomes a burden to her family, and leaves a degenerate offspring.

Kentucky and officiate as a minister. He replied that if a written invitation were sent him, signed only by those who were permanent settlers, and who wished to join a religious society, he would take the matter into consideration, and return an answer in due time. After a few months, a call, signed by three hundred men, was forwarded to him; and though he had reasonable cause to doubt the religious character of most of the subscribers, fortunately, or rather providentially, and happily for the Church, and for Kentucky, he finally resolved to accept it and remove to Kentucky, which he did in October, 1783. As he feared, he found few persons who were pious; but it was even worse than he feared. After he had been in the country some weeks, and had preached at several places, he scarcely found a man, and but few women, who supported a credible profession of religion. Quarreling and fighting, profane swearing and intemperance prevailed even among those who laid some claim to a religious character, and the forms of domestic religion were almost totally neglected. He very properly, therefore, deferred the immediate formation of a congregation, but preached among the people for a year, that he might form a better acquaintance with them. At the commencement of the second year, a congregation was organized in what is now Mercer County, with as much formality as their distance from other regular churches, and their other disadvantages, would permit. The congregation had three places of worship—Danville, Cane Run, and Forks of Dix River; and though the circumstances were unfavorable, Mr. Rice considered himself called to preach the gospel to these people, and leave the results to the good providence of God. How great have been those results! From this unfavorable beginning originated the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky. Here and then were founded the institutions of Danville, and were sown in faith and prayer the seeds of religion and knowledge, which have already produced so fruitfully, and are destined, we trust, in future ages, to produce so much more fruitfully to the glory of God and the welfare of man. Mr. Rice was the first of "the Men of Danville," and every way worthy to stand at the head of those who have usefully and honorably succeeded him, and at the head of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky as its founder and spiritual Father.

The town of Danville was laid out by Walker Daniel, who came to the county of Lincoln in 1781. He named it after himself.

He was a lawyer by profession, and is represented as a young man of rare talents, and gave promise of great distinction. His only competitor, at this period, was Christopher Greenup, afterward Governor of the State. Mr. Daniel was killed by the Indians in August, 1784, after a short residence of three years.

Other Presbyterian ministers came into Kentucky in a few years, of some of whom Mr. Rice does not seem to have formed a very favorable opinion: They were men of some information and held sound principles; but did not seem to possess much of the spirit of the gospel. His spirits sank very low, verging on deep melancholy. This disposition was perhaps constitutional, and owing to physical causes. It effected him all his life. Like a man of enlarged and catholic mind, he turned for comfort and encouragement to find a better state of religious feeling among other denominations. The Baptists were the first religious society in the country, but they were engaged in disputes on abstract points, which neither party much understood. About the same time two Methodist ministers came to the county, who, though rather passionate in their addresses, seemed to be men of a tender and catholic spirit, and supporters of good morals. Their preaching soon, however, assumed more of a sectarian spirit. Mr. Rice's spirits sank still lower under the discouraging prospects before him, and the low condition of religion and morals in the new country, which was rapidly filling up with a mixed and enterprising population from all parts of the world, who cared little for the cultivation of religion, and whose morals were loose. It is a mark of Mr. Rice's liberal spirit, that the arrival about this time of an old and pious Baptist minister, by the name of Gano, from New York, greatly rejoiced him. "I heard him," he says, "with avidity and satisfaction. He appeared to preach the gospel in its native simplicity, with honest intention to promote the glory of God and the good of men. To me he appeared to be one of the ancient Puritans rising from the dead."

Previously to Mr. Rice's arrival, marriages had been celebrated by the magistrates, but afterward the services of a clergyman were procured. On the 3d of June, 1784, he married a couple at McAfee's Station, and on the 4th, preached the funeral sermon of Mrs. James McCown, Sen., the first sermon ever preached on the banks of Salt River. After this Mr. Rice returned to the fort, and spent Saturday, according to his custom, in catechizing such

as felt an interest in religious matters. On Sunday he preached in a large double-hewed log house at the station. These details will give some idea of the state of society, and of the commencement of religious instruction in the country.

In consequence of the multiplication of congregations, and in order to form a bond of union for their better regulation, a general meeting for conference was held at Cane Run, March 30, 1785. At this conference three ministers were present—Mr. Rice, Adam Rankin, James Mitchell, and Terah Templin, a probationer. There were present ten representatives from congregations. The conference was organized by calling Mr. Rice to the chair, and appointing Caleb Wallace, afterward Judge of the Court of Appeals, clerk. They took steps to form themselves regularly into a Presbytery. Among other resolutions adopted was one worthy of especial notice, as the liberal spirit it inculcated has always characterized the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, and favorably distinguished it from the other denominations. Their people were enjoined to cultivate a catholic spirit toward other denominations; and, by a meek and Christian deportment, to impress all who had intercourse with them with a sense of the reality and importance of religion. This resolution may be safely attributed to Mr. Rice as its author. The conference adjourned to meet again in July following, when Mr. Rice was requested to open the meeting by a suitable sermon. It accordingly met at Cane Run meeting-house on Tuesday, July 12, 1785, Mr. Rice delivering a sermon from Isaiah lxii: 1—"For Zion's sake I will not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth." The ministers present were Messrs. Rice, Rankin, Templin and James Crawford. There were in attendance twenty-three representatives from twelve congregations. Mr. Rice was again called to preside. This statement of facts indicates an interest and growth in religion very favorable under such extraordinary circumstances, and we think Mr. Rice ought to have been greatly encouraged. The congregations were advised to provide convenient houses of worship, as soon as circumstances would permit. With characteristic zeal for the diffusion of knowledge, measures were recommended to procure suitable libraries for ministers. This conference, of so much importance in the history of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, bore, in its plan and all

its proceedings, and the admirable order and method which characterized them, the impress of the judicious and far-sighted mind of Mr. Rice.

The Presbytery of Transylvania was organized in the Court-house in Danville, October 17, 1786, under the authority of the Synod of Virginia, and consisted of five ministers, Mr. Rice presiding as Moderator.

In February, 1785, Mr. Rice opened at his house, in Lincoln County, a Grammar School, which was the foundation of Transylvania Seminary, of the Board of Trustees of which he was Chairman for several years. This School grew into the Seminary, and afterward into Transylvania University, and was the first Grammar School established in the country. When the Seminary afterward fell under Deistical influence, he took an active part in raising up a rival in the Kentucky Academy, and, in company with the Rev. Dr. Blythe, visited the Eastern cities to solicit donations for it.

In 1790, not content with his own personal duty, Mr. Rice wrote a circular letter to his ministerial brethren, proposing Paul as their common example. A revival of religion was the happy consequence in his own and other congregations, which continued for some months. During this period, not only were Christians interested, but at every communion a few converts were added to the Church. This reminds us of the long-continued interest on the subject of religion, continuing for years in his congregation in Virginia, already mentioned; and to express our greater confidence in revivals of this character over those periodical and distant excitements in which large numbers were added to the Church, followed by still longer periods of spiritual dearth and deadness. The Presbyterians and Baptists, at this period, had an equal number of congregations—sixteen of each denomination. But the latter had the advantage in the number of preachers, thirty-two, while the former had only seven. The latter were, no doubt, all uneducated men, while the former had more or less of a classical and scientific education. The two denominations pursued their several and distinct courses under Providence. The Baptists, of course, greatly excelled in the number of ministers and people, spreading religion and its influence among the masses of the people, who, but for them and these noble pioneers of Christ every-where, the Methodists, would have sunk into heathenism. May God continue to

bless both denominations still more abundantly, and all others who are preaching Christ and salvation through His blood. There is abundant work for all; let us not worry and devour each other, but labor, helping each other in the several departments of the Master's vineyard which He has assigned to us. If there is any thing hateful and wicked under the sun, it is sectarian bigotry, and envy and exclusiveness. We should mutually rejoice in each other's increase and prosperity, as we rejoice in the salvation of sinners, and the advancement of the Kingdom of the blessed Redeemer on earth. Because we differ in a few abstract points, or in a mode of administering one of the sacraments of the Church, or in forms of Church government, shall we feel the less interest in each other's progress, and shall we even commit the horrible sin of hating and devouring each other? We have all been guilty of it; let us cease it. It is by love that we shall see eye to eye. For our part, could we think and feel otherwise, we should not only doubt, but we should be certain we had no lot or part in the matter. If there is any thing, not merely odious, but ridiculous, it is the sight of a sect folding its arms in blind and Pharisaic pride, and arrogating to itself to be exclusively the Church of Christ, or even sanctimonious superiority in any wise. The Presbyterians, fewer in number, but with an educated ministry, set up and diffused the light of knowledge in the community, and the influence of religion over classes in society, who would otherwise have been in danger of despising it. All denominations have, for years, been advancing in the cultivation of learning, and let us rejoice for the good-doing and good influence of all who, under God, established the Christian religion literally in the wilderness, and worshiped—taking their guns with them to the house of worship, to protect themselves against the murderous and savage foe.

The Presbyterian Church in Kentucky was rent and convulsed at several periods of its early history, in a manner that threatened its very existence. In all these troubles, Mr. Rice acted the part of a wise and moderate adviser, and his influence was always for good. The first of these was the schism of Mr. Rankin, who was one of the original members of the conference first held, and of Transylvania Presbytery. Mr. Rankin had a mania on the subject of singing the Psalms of David, and considered himself specially sent of God to exterminate Watts' Hymns and Psalms

from the Church. He shielded himself under the sanction of a Divine warrant, claiming to be directed in this and all other affairs of moment by dreams and visions. Mr. Rice, to whom he had confided his dreams, solemnly warned him of the danger of being led into great errors and delusions, and expressed his strong disapprobation of reliance on dreams and night visions for direction in duty. Mr. Rankin was, finally, for contumacious and schismatical conduct, deposed from the ministry, Oct. 2, 1792.

As a good man and a patriot, Mr. Rice gave a portion of his heart and activity to the cause and welfare of his country politically. In the American struggle for independence he had taken a warm and zealous part, and did not esteem it unbecoming his clerical profession to harangue the people on their grievances at county meetings. In 1792 he permitted himself to be elected a member of the convention which met at Danville to frame a State Constitution. His object was worthy of the man and the occasion. He printed an address to the people of the State entitled, "Slavery inconsistent with Justice and Policy," which we shall particularly notice hereafter, and strenuously exerted himself, without success, to procure the insertion of an article in the Constitution providing for the gradual emancipation of Slavery, before the settlement of the question should be hampered by insuperable embarrassments. Had the efforts of this wise, good, and far-seeing man succeeded at that time, how different, as it must be evident to the eyes of all candid men, even those of pro-slavery sentiments, would have been the career and present condition of Kentucky, and even of the whole nation! She would have been a free State, with two millions of population; with treble her present wealth; all her mountainous regions being filled with the hum of manufactures, and covered with sheep-walks, and her rich central region with smiling farms, of smaller dimensions, worked by free hands—the foremost of all the West in prosperity and intelligence. In the present dreadful civil war, which, perhaps, in that event, however, would never have occurred, she would indeed have been exposed, as a frontier State, to its dangers, but with abundant ability to have taken care of and defended herself from all her enemies. Mr. Rice, however, sowed the seeds of freedom, which have borne some fruit ever since, and are yet destined, we trust, in God's good providence, to remove the foot of the slaver from the beautiful soil of Kentucky.

In the field of his original settlement, Mr. Rice labored fifteen years. He was now sixty-five years of age, and was troubled with an affection of the head, which incapacitated him for close and continuous thought, and subjected him to an almost habitual melancholy. He was also not a little tried by pecuniary embarrassments. He had purchased land on the faith of his congregation guaranteeing the payment, which, however, was so long deferred, if not entirely forgotten, that the good man and his family would have been actually reduced to want, had it not been for the seasonable and kindly interposition of a benevolent individual in the neighborhood.

Under these circumstances, in 1798, he removed to Green County, then a new settlement in the southern part of Kentucky. He did not, however, take a pastoral charge, nor attend much on Church courts, though he preached frequently in the way of assisting his brethren, and of supplying vacant congregations. In 1805 and 1806, he performed an extensive missionary tour through Kentucky and Ohio, by appointment of the General Assembly, with a view to ascertain particularly the religious condition of the country. After his return he addressed an epistle to the Presbyterians of Kentucky, published the same year, and afterward, in 1808, a second epistle, warning them with great fidelity and solemnity against what he believed to be the prevailing errors of the times. These epistles are distinguished for their intelligence, wisdom and sound doctrine. Happy were the churches of all denominations in those days of trial, in having so venerable and able a counselor and guide. In relation to the great revival, which had so sadly run to waste, and produced so much evil as well as good, he says, "that we had a revival of the spirit and power of Christianity among us, I did, and do, and ever shall believe until I see evidence to the contrary, which I have not seen; but we have sadly mismanaged it; we have dashed it down and broken it to pieces. Though I hope a number will have reason to bless God for it to all eternity; yet we have not acted as wise master builders, who have no need to be ashamed."

By the year 1802, the number of Presbyterians had so multiplied as to call for the erection of a Synod. On Tuesday, October 14, 1802, the Synod of Kentucky held its first meeting in the Presbyterian Church, in Lexington. Mr. Rice preached the opening sermon, and was elected Moderator. The number of mem-

bers present were thirty; of whom seventeen were ministers and thirteen elders. It will be noticed how controlling was the influence and character of Mr. Rice; he was always elected to preside over every advance made by the Church in extending her organization. In sixteen years from the arrival of the first clergyman in the field, the number had increased to twenty-six, distributed in three presbyteries, and in nineteen years they were formed into a Synod. To these were to be added several licentiates, and in all fifty Presbyterian ministers had preached the gospel within the State in the time last mentioned. It is painful, however, to have to acknowledge that, with two or three shining exceptions, the historian of the Church describes the majority of them to be men of barely respectable talents, and a few hardly above mediocrity; and, so far from being men of flaming zeal and apostolic devotion, a dull formality seems to have been their general characteristic. The melancholy mismanagement of the revival above alluded to, is evidence of the feebleness and incapacity of many of those ministers.

This extraordinary excitement occurred in the year 1800, and was attended in its course by most remarkable phenomena, to which we can barely allude. They were styled: 1. The Falling Exercise, in which some few fell suddenly, as if struck with lightning; while others were seized with universal tremor the moment before, and fell shrieking. 2. The Jerking Exercise, the subjects of which were instantaneously seized with spasms or convulsions in every muscle, nerve and tendon, which were attended with most frightful contortions. 3. The Rolling Exercise, which consisted in being violently prostrated, doubled with the head and feet together, and rolling over and over like a wheel, or turning swiftly over and over sideways like a log. 4. The Running Exercise; in this the person affected took a sudden start, and was impelled to run with amazing swiftness, as if engaged in a race, leaping over every obstacle in his way with preternatural agility. 5. The Dancing Exercise. 6. The Barking Exercise; this consisted in taking the position of a dog, moving about on all fours, growling and snapping with the teeth, and barking with such exactness of imitation, as to deceive any one whose eyes were not directed to the spot.

It is unnecessary to say that Mr. Rice protested with all his might against these follies and abuses; and we are informed that

the Presbyterian clergy, as a body, are not to be held responsible for those extravagant irregularities and enthusiastic fantasies.

Of the younger clergy, who patronized these exercises, Houston, McNemar and Dunlavy afterward became Shakers; Stone apostatized wholly from all the doctrines of the Church, and became the leader and head of the New Lights; Marshall and Thompson returned to the church, and several others became the leaders of the Cumberland Presbyterians. Through all these tempests, Mr. Rice, and other wise and judicious men, conducted the nearly shipwrecked vessel of the Church, and its precious cargo, in safety into calm seas, and finally into a safe harbor. Well might the venerable pilot have exclaimed in his grief:

O Navis, referant in mare te novi
Fluctus! O quid agis? fortiter occupa
Portum. Nonne vides, ut
Nudum remigio latus?

The name of Mr. Rice reappears through all these stormy times throughout all Davidson's *History of the Church*, always in the connection of a wise and steady leader, and firmer supporter of order and sound doctrine. In order to give a fuller idea of the labors and usefulness of this good man, we will recite some of these notices. Narrating the disorders of the revivals, it is said: "The venerable Father Rice, at an early period, with characteristic foresight, endeavored to guard against these evils; and had his advice been followed, the shocking disorders just recited might have been prevented, and the revival have gone on with greater purity, power, and splendor.

"There was a sacrament at Walnut Hill, on the first Sabbath of September, 1801, when the following clergymen were present, and took part: Marshall, Blythe, Rice, Lyle, Crawford, Welch, Stuart, and Rannals. Beside these, there were several Baptist preachers on the ground, Lewis, Craig, Smith, Bowman, and Davis, who occupied another stand. The negroes had still another by themselves. This meeting was held but about three or four months from the commencement of the revival in Upper Kentucky. On Saturday evening previous, Mr. Rice powerfully exhorted against noise and false exercise." Again it is said: "Not content with warning the laity, Mr. Rice sought to secure the coöperation of the clergy—the fountain-head of influence. In the evening of the

same day, (Saturday), he read to his ministerial brethren, at Mr. Crawford's house, a plan for regulating the camps at night," etc.

"After the conference at Walnut Hill in September following, and the rejection of Mr. Rice's plan for regulating the camps, the clergy and laity became divided into two distinct parties—the Orthodox and the New Lights; one assuming the honorable style of 'Revival Men,' and affecting superior sanctity and zeal in stigmatizing the other unjustly as 'Anti-Revival Men.' The latter were frequently denounced as hindrances to the work; and especially 'old Parson Rice' as standing in the way; as Deists at heart; as having no religion; while on themselves the effulgence of the new light shone, irradiating them with the knowledge of *The True New Gospel*.' With the enthusiastic or New Light party, who were the most forward and noisy, the elder clergy, and the more sober-minded, soon lost their influence, and found themselves under the necessity of looking on in silence, and enduring evils which they could not check."

McNemar and Thompson were brought to trial in 1803. Messrs. Rice, Houston, and Welch, to whom was afterward added Joseph P. Howe, were appointed a committee to confer with the seceding brethren and endeavor to reclaim them. In 1804, the General Assembly appointed Dr. James Hall, of North Carolina, to a mission within the bounds of the Presbytery of Washington, which he declined, and the Assembly, on the petition of the Synod, appointed Mr. Rice in his place. During the years 1805 and 1806, Messrs. Campbell and Stuart were directed by the General Assembly to travel over Northern Kentucky, and Messrs. Stuart and Rice over Southern Kentucky, with a view to regulate disorders, compose the distracted churches, and gather again the scattered flock. Messrs. Marshall and Thompson returned again to the bosom of the Church, which they did by issuing a pamphlet, publicly retracting their errors. Mr. Rice was still not perfectly satisfied of the soundness of their position, and while he hailed their return, he took the liberty of frankly communicating his disapprobation in a letter.

When the Cumberland Presbytery commenced licensing young men without education, through the agency of Mr. Rice the subject was brought to the notice of the General Assembly, meeting in Philadelphia. He addressed a letter to that venerable body by direction of the Presbytery of Transylvania, requesting advice

and direction on the delicate point of licensing men to preach without a liberal education. In 1804, Mr. Rice was one of a committee of Synod appointed to visit the Cumberland Presbytery, to inquire into these irregular licensures. At the meeting of Synod, in 1809, Mr. Rice proposed two plans for improving the condition of the Church. These notices show fully the constant and extensive influence of Mr. Rice on the Church, through the whole period of his useful life. In all important transactions he had a leading hand.

A remarkable example of Mr. Rice's humility and good sense was exhibited when it was proposed by some of his friends connected with the College of New Jersey to confer on him the degree of D. D.; a suggestion which he rejected with considerable determination, saying that there was a professional standing implied in that honorary degree to which he had not attained, and that consequently he would be ashamed to wear it. How many wear it not so well deserving it! The conferring of this honorary degree is usually supposed by the public, in their simplicity, to be spontaneous and for high merit. But it is frequently conferred only because it is importuned for by the recipient directly, or his friends indirectly. We were privy to an instance, a few years ago, in which a clergyman of Western New York applied directly and personally by letter, if we remember rightly, to a western College for the degree; but the Board of Trustees had independence enough to decline, on the ground that they were utterly ignorant of the merits and even the name of the individual previously, and that his application ought to be to an institution nearer home. He was not to be so easily balked; a year afterward we noticed his name duly announced in the *New York Observer* as having received the degree, doubtless, upon a similar application.

During the last three years of his life, Father Rice was prevented from preaching and writing almost entirely. He had no complaints, except those which arose from the regular decay of nature, till the beginning of the year 1815, when he had a slight apoplectic fit, from the effects of which he never recovered. On the day that completed his eightieth year, he preached at his own house his last sermon, Ps. xc: 12: "So teach us to number our days as to apply our hearts to wisdom." After this he made no appointments, except on the occasion of hearing of the death of

his son, Dr. David Rice, of Virginia, when he made a solemn address to his neighbors assembled at his dwelling. About the first of February, preceding his death, he was seized with a difficulty of breathing, which he received as an admonition that his end was near. Early in the succeeding May he was attacked with something like influenza, accompanied with fever and pain, and from this time till the close of his life, he had scarcely a momentary respite from bodily suffering. But he had the utmost tranquillity of mind in the prospect of his departure, and his last expressions indicated an impatience to be absent from the body, that he might be present with the Lord. He died on the 18th of June, 1816, in the eighty-third year of his age. His excellent wife died a few years before him. They had eleven children—six sons and five daughters.

The following estimate of his talents and character is given by the Rev. Dr. Cleland in a letter to Dr. Sprague: "Father Rice could hardly be considered as possessing talents of a very high order, though they were certainly highly respectable and eminently adapted to usefulness. His distinguished characteristic was sound judgment, and his disposition was conservative. He was remarkable for both the spirit and habit of devotion. You could not long be in his company without being deeply impressed with the idea that his affections had a strong tendency toward Heaven. In his general intercourse with society, he was dignified and grave; perhaps above most ministers of his day, insomuch that young people generally felt little freedom in his presence; but it was characteristic of that period that ministers usually carried themselves with more reserve, and were less accessible to persons of all classes than they are now. He did, however, occasionally unbend in familiar intercourse, and would now and then enliven conversation with an agreeable anecdote. He was a deeply earnest and effective preacher, delivering solemn and impressive thoughts in a solemn and impressive manner; and yet the effect of his manner was somewhat diminished by his occasionally taking a sympathetic tone, which, to many of his hearers, seemed like a departure from the simplicity of Nature. He had great executive powers, and he exerted them in various ways, for the general improvement of the community in which he lived. He was not only eminently faithful in his stated ministrations, but acted the part

of a father to the infant churches of Kentucky, besides devoting some share of his attention to literature, and even politics.

"Mr. Rice was tall and slender in person, and quiet in his movements, and, even at seventy, he exhibited a remarkable degree of alertness. At that advanced period I may safely say that no minister in Kentucky filled a wider space than he did. He was not like the eccentric Comet, with its long fiery tail, which attracts the gaze and awakens the expectations of beholders for a few days, and then disappears, but as the glorious Sun, which, by its regular and constant influences, encircles our fields, illumines our horizon, and gladdens our hearts."

This comparison gives us an exalted and beneficent idea of the character, and services, and usefulness of David Rice. In thus bringing before the attention of the present generation the character of Mr. Rice, our principal object remains yet to be stated. We have alluded to the fact that Mr. Rice was a member of the convention that formed the first Constitution of Kentucky, and that he published an address to the people on the injustice and impolicy of Slavery, and endeavored to have engrafted a clause in the Constitution favorable to the gradual emancipation of slaves, which came within a few votes of being successful. If he had succeeded in his purpose, he would have become a benefactor, whose services would have thrown all other personages in the earlier history of the State entirely into the shade. The arguments presented by him may not be without benefit at this eventful crisis, in which the fate of the State, in regard to Slavery, is again before the people for their determination. They may yet voluntarily take it out of the hands of inevitable events and the action of the General Government, and terminate it with honor and dignity by their own voice and action. It will be no honor in the sight of God or man to submit passively, unwillingly, and doggedly to consequences which we can not help, or to have Slavery terminated by a direct action of the General Government. That it will be terminated in one of these ways, either by the action of the Government, or by the unavoidable results of the war, and that soon, is felt by all thoughtful and even unthoughtful persons. Should a portion of our people, and especially should the legal authorities of the State attempt, at this late day, which we fully believe they will not, to prevent this predicted event by resistance, they will bring upon the State still greater

evils than any she has yet experienced tenfold in severity, and, if the resistance should be any thing like extensive and general, utter ruin. Against such folly we earnestly, and from the bottom of our hearts, warn our fellow-citizens. Disapproving, as we do, many things that have been done by the Government, and fearing that we shall yet have to disapprove of other measures, we yet advise our people, as lovers of Kentucky and its dear soil, only less than we love the Union, to submit for the present, and until they can be remedied at the ballot-box, to whatever injuries we may receive at the hands of the Administration or Congress; yea, to submit to the last bitter drop, however distasteful or abhorrent. And the reasons for doing so are perfectly obvious: We can't help ourselves, if we would, and should not, by violence, if we could. Violent resistance is a remedy for nothing; because it would be fatuitous; because it would be suicidal. May God, in His infinite mercy and grace, give our people wisdom to see it thus! We address our remonstrance even to secessionists and rebels in principle, if they have any discretion—any prudence—any sense left.

MR. RICE'S VIEWS OF SLAVERY.

But to return to Mr. Rice's address. To Presbyterians especially ought the voice of this venerable man speak with weight, and be listened to with reverence. It is the voice and the words, let it be reverently remembered, of a contemporary of Washington, and a companion of our venerable and beloved forefathers, who achieved the Revolution, and laid the foundation of our Government. These are not the malign words of a modern and infidel abolitionist, and are not to be despised as such. They are plainly and not mincingly spoken. It is but the personification of the voices of the fathers. The reader hears Washington, and Franklin, and Henry, and all the rest, speak in these words, which we quote. If he curses them for abolitionists, let him beware that the Scripture curse fall not upon him: "The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it."

"A slave," says Mr. Rice, "is a human creature, made by law the property of another human creature, and reduced by mere power to an absolute, unconditional subjection to his will." He argues, that, with respect to liberty, all men are equal before God,

and that no one can lose this gift of Nature except by a just forfeiture, which will justify society in depriving him of it. "And if I deprive him of his liberty," he says, "I injure him much more than if I robbed him of his property on the highway. In this case it does not belong to him to prove a negative, but to me to prove that such a forfeiture has been made; because, if it has not, he is certainly still the proprietor of his own person and limbs." "All he has to do, is to show the insufficiency of my proofs." "A slave claims his freedom; he pleads that he is a man; that he was by nature free; that he has not forfeited his freedom, nor relinquished it. Now, unless his master can prove that he is not a man, that he was not born free, or that he has forfeited or relinquished his freedom, he must be judged free—the justice of his claim must be acknowledged. His being long deprived of his right, by force or fraud, does not annihilate it; it remains; it is still his right." "Is there any need of argument to prove that it is, in a high degree, unjust and cruel to reduce one human creature to such an abject state as this, that he may minister to the ease, luxury and avarice of another? Has not that other the same right to reduce him to that state, that he may minister to his interest and pleasure? On what is this right founded? Whence was it derived? Did it come from heaven, from earth or from hell? Has the great King of Heaven, the absolute disposer of all men, given this extraordinary right of white men over black men? Where is the charter? In whose hands is it lodged? Let it be produced and read, that we may know our privileges. Such arguments as these may have small weight with the sciolists and pigmies of these degenerate days; but they were considered sound and unquestionable by the giants of the day that pronounced it a self-evident truth, 'that all men are born free and equal.' The men of that day were not to be hoodwinked by false facts or sophistical arguments, nor by almost blasphemous appeals to Scripture in support of an institution that violates every fundamental principle of Christianity, and outrages every honest instinct of the human heart. In those days, these honest instincts were followed."

Let the clear distinction be taken between the toleration and approval of Slavery. Our fathers did as the Scriptures do—they tolerated this great evil, because they could not at once remove it; but, like the gospel which laid down moral principles which would

finally cut it up by the roots, they laid down, in their fundamental political declarations, principles which were intended to root it out of society, and restore freedom to every human being, and were confidently expected to do so in the early progress of our institutions. Evil must be tolerated where it can not be at once extinguished. It must be limited and restrained, and, as individuals and society, we must do what we can in the conflict with it and against it. God has tolerated its existence in every form for six thousand years; but, because He has tolerated it, shall we, therefore, presumptuously quote His Word as approving it in one of the worst forms it has ever afflicted our race, whether we regard its influence on the master or the slave? for really it is a matter of earnest doubt which it injures most—at least this American Negro-Slavery of ours.

“If we plead for Slavery,” indignantly exclaims Mr. Rice, “we plead for the disgrace and ruin of our nation. If we are capable of it, we may ever after claim kindred with the brutes, and renounce our own superior dignity.”

But it is useless to contest the abstract evil of Slavery; when we come to examine its practical character, as it exists in our country—a man must be lost to all sense of right who can seriously defend it. Indeed no Christian man, and hardly, indeed, any *un-Christian* man, will defend its practical workings and concomitants.

“That a slave,” says Mr. Rice, “is made after the image of God, no Christian will deny; that a slave is absolutely subjected to be debauched by men, is so apparent, from the nature of Slavery, it needs no proof. This is evidently the unhappy case of female slaves, a number of whom have been remarkable for their chastity and modesty. If their master attempts their chastity, they dare not resist or complain. If another man should make the attempt, though resistance may not be so dangerous, complaints are equally vain. They can not be heard in their own defense; their testimony can not be admitted. The injurious person has a right to be heard; may accuse the innocent sufferer of malicious slander, and have her severely chastised.” If it be said the sufferer is generally, if not always, a willing victim, how much more evil is that institution which degrades human beings so low, that every female can be induced to sell her virtue for a gewgaw, or surrender it gratuitously as not worth the keeping, and in which she suffers no degradation in her own eyes, or those of

her class, or in those of master or mistress, by its loss? Does the bare statement of such a state of society not bring down upon it the immediate and unhesitating condemnation of every impartial and right-thinking mind? Is there one, outside of the slave States of America, and within the precincts of Christendom, who will not instinctively and immediately condemn it? Not one. It meets the condemnation of the whole civilized world.

"The slave," says Mr. Rice, "is held by his Maker accountable for his action, and yet, by Slavery, he is deprived of his freedom of action," and ironically exclaims: "This comes to pass through a great omission and inconsistency of the Legislature. They ought further to have enacted, in order to be consistent, that the slave should not have been accountable for his actions; but that his master should have been answerable for him in all things here and hereafter."

Other of the dearest relations of human existence are violated by Slavery, which no Christian man will defend. We quote again from Mr. Rice: "The principles of conjugal love and fidelity in the breast of a virtuous pair, of natural affections in parents and of a sense of duty in children, are inscribed there by the finger of God; they are the laws of heaven; but an enslaving law directly opposes them, and virtually forbids obedience. The relations of husband and wife and of parent and child are formed by Divine authority, and founded on the laws of nature. But it is in the power of a cruel master, and often of a needy creditor, to break these tender connections, and forever to separate these dearest relations. This is ever done, in fact, at the call of interest or humor. The poor sufferers may expostulate; they may plead; they may plead with tears; their hearts may break; but all in vain. The laws of nature are violated, the tender ties are dissolved, a final separation takes place, and the duties of these relations can no longer be performed, nor their comforts enjoyed. Would these slaves perform the duties of husbands and wives, parents and children? The law disables them; it puts it altogether out of their power." Mr. Rice continues with overpowering and unrelenting argument: "In these cases, it is evident the laws of nature or the laws of man are wrong; and which, none will be at a loss to judge. The Divine law says, whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder; the law of man says to the master of the slave: 'Though the Divine law has joined them together, you may put

them asunder when you please.' The Divine law says: Train up a child in the way he should go: the law of man, 'You shall not train up your child but as your master thinks proper.' The Divine law says: Honor your father and mother, and obey them in all things: but the law of man says, 'Honor and obey your master in all things, and your parents just as far as he shall direct you.'"

Another most flagrant outrage of Slavery upon the Divine rights of humanity, is thus strongly stated by Mr. Rice: "Another consequence of our definition is, that a slave being a free moral agent and an accountable creature, is a capable subject of religion and morality; but deprived by law of the means of instruction in the doctrines and duties of morality any further than his master pleases. It is in the power of the master to deprive him of all means of religious and moral instruction, either in private or public. Some masters have actually exercised this power, and restrained their slaves from the means of instruction by the terror of the lash. Slaves have not opportunity at their own disposal for instructive conversation; it is put out of their power to learn to read; and their masters may restrain them from other means of information. Masters designedly keep their slaves in ignorance, lest they should become too knowing to answer their selfish purposes, and too wise to rest easy in their degraded situation. In this case the law operates so as to answer an end directly opposed to the proper end of all law. It is pointed against every thing dear to them; against the principal end of their existence. 'It supports, in a land of religious liberty, the severest persecutions, and may operate so as to rob multitudes of their religious principles and the rights of conscience.'"

This statement of the case places the condemnation of Slavery as an existing and actual and practical institution beyond dispute with any reasonable Christian man. Can that power in the slave institution be right, which deprives the slave of the free knowledge of God and his holy worship; of the free acquirement and use of the means for the salvation of the immortal soul? Whatever else there may be in Slavery which is right, surely this quality is wrong. Mr. Rice concludes this part of the subject with solemnly declaring that, "the injury done the slave is much greater than what is generally esteemed a just ground of war between different nations; it is much greater than was the cause of the war between us and

Great Britain." This was said in a very few years after the close of that war.

Mr. Rice now, as a statesman, turns his attention to the effects of Slavery upon the master and the State. He says: "Slavery naturally tends to sap the foundation of morals, and consequently of political virtue; and virtue is absolutely necessary for the happiness of a free people. Slavery produces idleness; and idleness is the nurse of vice. A vicious Commonwealth is a building erected on quicksand, the inhabitants of which can never abide in safety."

"The prosperity of a country depends upon the industry of its inhabitants; idleness will produce poverty; and when Slavery becomes common, industry sinks into disgrace. To labor is to *slave*; to work is to *work like a negro*; and this is disgraceful; it levels us with the meanest of the species; it sits hard upon the mind; it can not patiently be borne. Youth are tempted to idleness, and drawn into other vices: they see no way to keep their credit and acquire some importance. This renders them like those they ape, nuisances of society. It frequently tempts to gaming, theft, robbery, and forgery; for which they often end their days in disgrace on the gallows. Since every State must be supported by industry, it is exceedingly unwise to admit what will inevitably sink it into disgrace, and that is the tendency of Slavery is known from matter of fact." How accurately has Mr. Rice daguerreotyped the moral condition of the Slave States in this extract! "Put all the above considerations together," he says, "and it evidently appears that Slavery is neither consistent with justice nor good policy. These considerations one would think sufficient to silence every objection; but I foresee, notwithstanding, that a number will be made, some of which have a formidable appearance."

It will be hard, we think, to defend Slavery as an actual and practical institution against these statements of its characteristics, whatever might be said in its defense as an abstraction. As we have intimated, all are not disposed to war upon the institution, in its abstract relations, if it have any such. It is, as it exists among us, that we arraign it at the bar of the public judgment. Let the relation of husband and wife be rendered legal and inviolate by law—let the relation of parent and child be recognized as sacred and inviolable—let the slave be secured in the full enjoyment of religious instruction; the right to be taught to read the Word of God, and we are content, and wait the progress of things to secure him his ulti-

mate liberty, which would assuredly come in due time. Now, who will say he ought not to enjoy these relations and rights inviolate? Is there any Christian man under heaven that can refuse them? But the abolitionist will exclaim, he ought to have these and all other rights immediately—Slavery is a sin against God, and all sin ought immediately to cease. This is a practical world we live in, and we have to be governed sometimes by what can be done—what is practicable, and to be content therewith. The immediate abolition of Slavery is impracticable, impossible, beyond any human power. The President of the United States a year and a half ago hurled his proclamation of freedom against it, and all the power of the United States in arms has been since wielded against it, without accomplishing its overthrow as yet. The Saviour and his disciples contented themselves with laying down principles which would ultimately overthrow this and every form of evil. We must endeavor to inculcate and wisely enforce these principles as fast and as far as it may be done. Further than this is impracticable and impossible, and therefore hurtful. We may insist upon and obtain the moral and religious improvement of the negro race. This is necessary to their welfare, slave or free: indeed freedom without virtue and religion, would be no boon to them, rather a curse.

Mr. Rice then turns his attention to the objections against the doctrines of freedom. First, it would prevent the immigration into the country of settlers. He replies, that it would prevent no immigrants but slaveholders, and their exclusion would be a blessing. He alludes to another *ad captandum* objection urged down to the present day to raise the prejudices of the people—"that should we set our slaves free, it would lay a foundation for intermarriages, and an unnatural mixture of blood; our posterity, at length, would be mulattoes." This objection ought to be received as an insult by the whole white race. It is directly supposing that it is only slavery that prevents our seeking the negro race in marriage, and that as soon as they are free, we shall rush into their arms. Of course, no such intermarriage would take place without the seeking and consent of the whites, and to suppose such is irrational and insulting. If it were addressed to us under other circumstances, it would be so esteemed, and the man who offered the insult would go near to getting his head broken for his pains. But we assert that the very contrary would be the fact. That amalgamation which is now going on so rapidly, and has been from the beginning, would immediately

cease. The degradation of the African female ceasing, and the proximity produced by Slavery between the races ceasing, illegitimate—and much more, legitimate—intercourse would almost cease. The two races would be cast farther apart, and intermarriage between a white and a black would be a rare occurrence, and compared to the present and shameful course of amalgamation produced by Slavery, of which we hear no complaint whatever by these purists, a nonentity.

PATRIARCHAL SLAVERY.

Mr. Rice refers to the support so greedily sought by the advocates of Slavery from the example of Abraham. In the first place, if the example of Abraham be taken in support of Slavery, it may be quoted equally in support of the marriage of a half sister. If we quote the example of the patriarchs in support of Slavery, why may it not be quoted in support of Polygamy? Jacob married four wives. But let us look at the character of Slavery existing at the time of Abraham; for all Slavery is not the same Slavery. It is as a practical institution we regard it—not what it may have been in former ages or other countries, but as it actually is among us. This scrutiny will prove too much on the one hand, and too little on the other, for the use of the advocates of modern negro Slavery. The slaves of Abraham's day must have been of the same race with himself—the white race. Then his example justifies not the enslaving of the negro only, but also of the white men, women and children. Secondly, they must have been either recent captives in war, or persons who, like Joseph, were seized and sold into Slavery violently, or those who had been sold for debt, or who sold themselves or their children into Slavery. For these were the methods in which Slavery then originated; for it was a very recent thing. Then the example of Abraham would justify us in selling into Slavery the captives whom we take in this wretched civil war from our brethren of the South; or the holding in Slavery persons like Joseph, whose unnatural relations should sell them into Slavery; or unfortunate persons who might be induced to sell themselves or children into Slavery, of our own race, which might easily be brought into practice if the laws of the country would sanction it. It is white Slavery then, and the enslavement of our brethren and neighbors, that the example of Abraham justifies. It does not, therefore, suit the case.

Again, Slavery in the time of Abraham was a mild affair compared with negro Slavery among us. Why, that very thing against which the objectors turn up their eyes in holy horror, intermarriage between master and slave, actually took place in Abraham's own case. He married—that is, took as a second wife, and what is worse at his wife's solicitation, his maid-servant. If they quote Abraham in support of Slavery, we could as legitimately quote him in favor of Amalgamation. Indeed, Jacob married two of his slaves at the solicitation, again, of his two wives, and four of the tribes of Israel were actually the descendants of his two slave women. This proves too much. Nay, the whole of Jacob's slaves went down with him and his children into Egypt, and were incorporated with the Israelites, and became a part and parcel of the Israelitish nation.

The character of Slavery as existing among the Patriarchs may be seen, in that Abraham armed three hundred of his slaves and pursued after Chederlaomer and the kings that were with him, and defeated them and retook his nephew Lot, and all the spoil of Sodom from them. He sent his slave Eleazar to perform the important and delicate duty of selecting a wife for his son Isaac; which duty he performed with consummate tact, promptness, piety and faithfulness. In view of his childless condition, he had moreover previously declared that this same slave, Eleazar of Damascus, in case he should die without a child, would be his legal heir. Meaning no doubt that as next to himself in authority, his chief steward, he would naturally and necessarily succeed to the headship of the tribe which he had gathered and established. In fact, these slaves of Abraham were his dependents—his subjects. He was their prince. "Thou art a mighty prince among us," said the children of Heth to Abraham on the notable occasion of purchasing from them the Cave of Machpelah for a burial possession; as so beautifully and exquisitely related in the 23d chapter of Genesis. Some of those Abraham had, no doubt, bought with his money—but it is hardly to be supposed that so many as three hundred men, and all the women and children, their wives and offspring, had been purchased by Abraham, or had been born in his family. Doubtless, many of them had voluntarily put themselves under his authority, had become his slaves, or subjects, or dependents for protection. There was a mutual relation between them of fealty, and service, and protection, something similar to the

condition of vassals under the feudal system. They were his liege subjects, servants, slaves—he was their liege lord. But whatever was their condition, it was utterly different from that of a negro slave. They intermarried with their master—they were his soldiers or warriors—their head was his legal heir. Moreover, they were introduced by God's express command into a state still more intimate, and which, according to the subsequent laws of Moses, was equivalent to an act of manumission—at least made them Israelites by adoption and entitled to complete freedom on the seventh year; for no Israelite could be held in Slavery more than seven years. Abraham circumcised every member of his family and every male servant, thus making them members of the Church of God, and virtually members of his own family and entitled to all their privileges. These facts will show the very different relations in which Abraham's slaves stood to him from those in which our negro slaves stand to us, and how preposterous it is to quote Abraham in support of a system of Slavery as different in character as it could well be. We hear nothing of Abraham selling his slaves—separating husband from wife and parent from child in so doing; and the facts above alluded to, show they were not held as mere chattels in the sense in which he held his camels, asses, sheep and goats.

The whole of ancient Slavery, not only among the Israelites, but among all ancient nations, was different from ours. In ancient times, princes and princesses were liable to and were often actually reduced to the abject condition of menial servants; but, on the other hand, slaves were often raised to the highest position, as was Joseph. Female slaves were often raised to the beds of their masters, and became their favorite wives, and sometimes to thrones, as is still the fact in the East. Slaves were made freedmen, and stood in the most confidential relations to their masters—their descendants rising to the highest position in society. Horace was the son of a Roman freedman. Tiro, one of Cicero's slaves, wrote a life of his master, and to him we are indebted for collecting and transmitting to posterity Cicero's letters.* Tiro was trained up in Cicero's family, among the rest of his young slaves, in every kind of useful and polite learning, and, being a youth of singular parts of industry, soon became an eminent scholar, and

* Middleton's Life of Cicero.

extremely serviceable to his master in all his affairs, both civil and domestic. The ancients were not afraid to educate their slaves—many of them were the most learned men of the times. Here is a letter which Cicero wrote to him on occasion of having left him behind in sickness :

“I thought I should have been able to bear the want of you more easily, but in truth I can not bear it; and though it is of great importance to my expected honor to be at Rome as soon as possible, yet I seem to have committed a sin when I left you. But since you were utterly against proceeding in the voyage, till your health was confirmed, I approved of your resolution; nor do I now think otherwise, if you continue in the same mind. But after you have begun to take meat again, if you think that you should be able to overtake me, that is left for your consideration. I have sent Mario to you with instructions, either to come with you to me as soon as you can, or, if you should stay longer, to return instantly with you. Assure yourself, however, of this, that, as far as it can be convenient to your health, I wish for nothing more than to have you with me; but if it be necessary for the perfection of your recovery to stay awhile longer at *Petræ*, that I wish nothing more than to have you well. If you sail immediately, you will overtake me at *Leucas*; but, if you stay to establish your health, take care to have good company, good weather, and a good vessel. Observe this one thing, my *Tiro*, if you love me, that neither Mario’s coming, nor this letter hurry you. By doing what is most conducive to your health, you will do what is most agreeable to me; weigh all things by your own discretion. I want you; yet so as to love you; my love makes me wish to see you well; my want of you, to see you as soon as possible: the first is the better; take care, therefore, above all things, to get well again—of all your innumerable services to me, that will be most acceptable. The third of November.” During his sickness, Cicero wrote letters to him by every ship, and sent a servant to see him, and bring word of his health. How should this letter make us Christian masters blush!

THE MOSAIC INSTITUTIONS—A THOROUGH SYSTEM OF GRADUAL
EMANCIPATION.

But the laws of Moses are appealed to in behalf of Slavery. Here it will be found again that, on the one hand, they prove too

much, and, on the other, not enough for our negro Slavery. By the law of Moses, a man might sell his child into slavery, Ex. xxi: 7: "If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant," etc. A man might sell himself into Slavery, Lev. xxv: 39: "And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee," etc. The children of solvent debtors might be sold into Slavery for the payments of their parents' debts. See 2 Kings iv: 1. A thief might be sold into Slavery if unable to make restitution, Ex. xxii: 3. If Moses be good for one form of Slavery, he is equally good for another; and therefore a free white man may sell himself into Slavery; he may sell his children, or his children may be sold for his debts. Our Legislature, under constitutional authority, might pass laws to sanction these acts, and justify them by the laws of Moses. It is in vain to try to escape these facts. Moses proves too much; but, again, he proves too little. For, in the seventh year, every Hebrew slave recovered his freedom, Deut. xv: 12: "And if thy brother, a Hebrew man, or Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee." Nor was this all: "And when thou sendest him away free from thee, thou shalt not let him go empty: thou shalt furnish liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine-press: of that which the Lord thy God hath blessed thee, shalt thou give him." Again, at the year of Jubilee, every Hebrew slave was set free. See Lev. xxv: 39, 40, 41. And the slaves who were foreigners were allowed to join themselves unto Israel, and to become circumcised, and so to become entitled to every privilege of an Israelite. Now, if American slaveholders, who appeal to the laws of Moses, are content to abide by them and follow their regulations, we are content they shall have the full benefit of his institutions. The truth is, Moses found Slavery as he found other evil institutions; the right of divorce, for instance, at pleasure, on the part of the man; the right to put away his wife, with reason or without it, and without assigning any, firmly imbedded in the habits of the Israelites, as in all the nations of the East, and not being able to eradicate it, by immediate emancipation, he instituted a thorough system of gradual emancipation, which cut it up at the seventh year, and again at the year of Jubilee, and thus prevented it from ever becoming permanent. And the permission and encouragement of foreigners

to become proselytes, placed them on a voluntary equality with the native-born Israelite; and so there was and could be no such institution as American Slavery among the Israelites. If a man fell into Slavery, he was delivered in seven years, and at the year of Jubilee freedom was proclaimed to the whole land. How absurd, then, to appeal to such a system of laws—expressly framed to render Slavery, as a permanent institution, impossible, and to break it up as far as it could be done in such an age and in such a state of society—in support of Negro Slavery, a perpetual institution, with concomitants such as we have above described it! The Mosaic system was expressly intended to abolish Slavery, and did do it. Slavery among the Israelites was hydra-headed, and the Mosaic system cut off the head every seven years, and at the day of Jubilee slew the monster. When it again reappeared, it was again, and through every succeeding age, destroyed.

But, hard pressed in conscience, the Christian slaveholder appeals to the blessed Jesus and his disciples for countenance. He pleads that Jesus did not forbid Slavery. He approved of every thing he did not, in so many direct words, forbid, did he? Then he approved of the oppressive and atrocious tyranny of the Roman Empire, under which the Jews groaned. He approved of all the wicked civil and political institutions and practices of the Empire. He approved of the cruel death by crucifixion, by which He himself was to suffer, and under which so many persons, criminal and innocent, perished in unutterable agonies every year. He approved of throwing their aged and worn out slaves into their fish-ponds for food for their fish. He approved the bloody gladiatorial exhibitions, in which hundreds of innocent men were yearly condemned to fight each other and wild beasts unto the death, for the amusement of the populace in all the principal cities of the Empire. What did He not approve of under this rule of interpretation? His apostles enjoined on servants to be obedient to their masters; they, therefore, approved Slavery. They equally enjoined on masters to give to their servants that which is "just and equal." If this precept were literally obeyed, it would soon break up our slave institution. But can the apostles of Christ be quoted in favor of an institution which, in detail, violates every principle of Christianity? which does not only not give to the servant that which is "just and equal," but tears away from him his wife and children, and sells them into distant bond-

age at the pleasure or interest of the master; which regards them equally as chattels with the horses and cows of the field; which tears him from his wife and children, and sends him into distant bondage; nay, which denies to him the right of marriage, and the right of the control and education of his own children; and, to cap the climax of moral wrong, denies to him the right, and forcibly withholds it from him, of learning to read God's Holy Word; and yet appeals to that Word in support of its unjust and unprincipled ordinances!

The Saviour and his apostles were careful to abstain from interfering in all matters of "Cæsar"—in all matters of civil and political institutions, however wrong, or even atrocious. These he proposed to correct by correcting the private characters of both subjects and rulers—the only way in which they could possibly be corrected. To have done otherwise, would have been to strangle the infant religion in its birth. But the law of universal love was applied to every evil institution, moral and political, and cut it up by the roots.

THE REMEDY.

What remedy do we propose for this great evil? We do not now propose emancipation, either immediate or gradual. We were not in favor of the President's proclamation of freedom, or the arming of negroes. Our only remedy is that which the Saviour Himself proposed for every human evil, moral and political: the Gospel. It is the full and free communication of the truths of Christianity, and moral intelligence, and the Bible itself to the negro race among us. We would be perfectly content then to leave their fate, in every other respect, untouched, and their ultimate destiny to be worked by the gospel alone. We insist upon the full performance of this duty on the part of the white race—a duty that can not be neglected without overwhelming guilt, and without most destructive consequences to both races—a duty which God has imposed, and which is not to be shunned with impunity. It is a duty as yet scarcely at all performed to any appreciable extent. It is the duty of the North and of the South. It is our duty, if Slavery continues to exist; it is our duty, if it is overthrown by the war. It is the object for which God, in His Providence, permitted this oppressed race to be brought among us.

The African race is one of the permanent races of the earth—their number is variously estimated from fifty to one hundred millions. They will be christianized. The gospel can be better taught to them by men of their own race than by the whites. Providence has brought and raised up among us over four millions, under most favorable circumstances for improvement. This has been slowly advancing for two centuries. But the time has come for more effective and rapid progress. Besides all the usual and obvious ways of proceeding in the execution of this great duty, there are two things which we desire to suggest as, in our view, indispensable to success. The low and exposed moral condition of the female slaves has been very distinctly alluded to by Mr. Rice. Here is a point of vital importance. If the women of this unfortunate race can not be raised in character, nothing can be done of much effect in their behalf. In this matter we are peculiarly guilty. The virtue of our female servants has been little more to us than that of our cows. We have given no attention whatever to their training. Not a virtuous idea has ever been inculcated—not an admonition given. Not a spark of interest in their moral welfare manifested. Their lapse from virtue has never, in the slightest degree, disturbed master or mistress, or even young mistress, upon whom they have waited, only so far as its consequences may have interfered with their convenience or interest. The character of the unfortunate girl, to refer to a single instance, has not suffered in the least. She is neither more nor less esteemed than before. She and her child are well and kindly cared for as property, and perhaps even affectionately cared for as human beings. The babe is smiled on and even petted. But nothing more is said or done. No inquiry made; no questions asked; no regret expressed; none felt. The whole matter is passed by with as much nonchalance as the birth of a calf or colt, perhaps more. The poor girl is undegraded in the eyes of all around her, and, of course, in her own eyes. She has no character—she is conscious of possessing none. She feels no responsibility to God or man. She has grown up without religious ideas, and lives without them, and dies without them. If a different result follows, as often does, it is of spontaneous action. The female heart, at length, yearns after a mate of its own and finds one, and honorable to human nature, remains faithful to the husband of her affections till he is torn from her. His loss or that of some of her children

by sale, if it does not harden and brutalize her heart, or some other afflictive providence at length, brings her in tears of penitence before God, of whom she has learned something, and to seek for the sympathy of Christ, of whose love to sinners she has heard whisperings, which have sunk into her heart. She becomes, in her simple way, a faithful Christian; with a few plain principles of the gospel and her own good sense, and renewed heart alone to guide her.

Now, all this must be changed. Those servants must be cared for from their infancy—instruction in all virtuous principles and conduct must be given them—they should be watched over and admonished, encouraged and threatened. Lapse from good conduct should bring disgrace and punishment. Marriage should be promoted and held sacred. The separation of husband and wife, parent and child, should be considered infamous and inconsistent with the first principles of a Christian profession. In a single generation, under such a course of treatment, the whole character of the negro race would be greatly changed for the better. This course of treatment is our bounden duty, for which we shall be held to fearful responsibility, whether the present war shall result in their liberation, or not. If it does, every principle and motive of Christian duty, and private and national welfare and interest, will impel to the full and faithful communication of the gospel to this race, whom God has placed under our care for that express purpose, and none other. Woe, woe—tenfold and unutterable woe to us, if we are found delinquents toward them in this behalf. Better, as a nation, we had never been born—better a mill-stone were hanging about our necks, and we were cast into the midst of the sea.

PREPARATION OF A NATIVE MINISTRY.

In order to the effectual communication of the gospel to the negro race, an intelligent, native ministry must be raised up. Their present religious opportunities are wholly haphazard. They are in some churches allowed an obscure corner in the house; which a few of them creep into, as if ashamed to be seen there, and where they gather up a few of the crumbs which fall from the master's table. Many more of them have to rely for all their religious instruction upon native preachers wholly, or nearly wholly, ignorant of letters—blind leaders of the blind—sometimes men of notoriously bad character, who assume the position from sinister motives; while some of them are, no doubt, sincere men in their way. Their readiness

to attend upon a native ministry in crowds, and their unwillingness to attend upon the preaching of white men, are notorious. It is useless to say, they must or ought to attend upon the same ministry with their masters, or, if free, with the whites. The answer is, they won't do it, and there's an end on't. An intelligent native ministry they must have, and it is our duty to provide it for them. Pious colored youths should be raised up, and sought out, and brought into the ministry, both free and slave, with more or less education, adequate to the calls of the case. This must be done, or the negroes will remain semi-heathen, however, many of them may crowd the native meeting-houses, for long years to come. We are profoundly impressed with this fact, and only wish we could impress our readers as profoundly as it stirs our own bosom. Here is the great mission and duty of the Christian Church of America. Let us do our full duty to the heathen abroad; but we are unspeakably guilty if we neglect those at home for whom Christ died, and whom He has placed in our very families to be brought up in His kingdom for Him—instruments to be prepared for the further and greater work of evangelizing the many millions of their brethren in the father-land. It especially behooves the Presbyterian Church, as foremost in every good work of education, to take the lead in this matter, and establish a school in Kentucky for the education and training of native negro ministers of the gospel. This will, no doubt, be thought by some a startling proposition; but we live in an era of revolution and startling events. A new order of things has come. Let us remember it has come under God, and must be met by the Christian Church and its members at least, and dealt with as these terrible events demand. There will be no escaping and shirking duty. It has seized us unceremoniously by the throat and sternly demands payment and performance. Obedience will be life and health, prosperity and happiness—the favor and approval of God, of our own consciences, and the whole Christian world. Disobedience will be—but we turn our visions with fear and terror from the dark and fearful retributions which would follow. We will not anticipate them.

The duty is plain, and we content ourselves for the present with having done our duty in its simple proposal, leaving it to the Church for matter of thoughtful consideration. We pray God this may be done in a manner becoming the gravity and importance of the subject and duty.

ART. VI.—*Experiment in Translation of the Talmud—Valuable Things in the Talmud.*

ABODAH ZARAH is the Hebrew word for idolatry, or heathen worship. It is also the name of one of the thirty-six divisions of the Talmud—that division which is the treatise on the relations between Jews and Gentiles. The Rev. Ferdinand Christian Ewald, of London, in 1856, presented to the theological world a book, with the title *Abodah Zarah*—a translation of all the division or treatise in the Talmud bearing this name. He felt that, in this translation, he was cutting out a new path, in which there was no forerunner for him, on whom he could keep his eye. He says, in his Preface, that while the sacred literature of the most distant nations has been given to us in translations and treatises, the Talmud still remains a sealed book. No complete translation of even a single division of the Talmud had ever come to his knowledge. We rejoice at the sight of this translation. There are many facts locked up in the Talmud, sufficient to build up a new Fort Defiance for Christianity against modern Rationalists. Very few Christian Theologians know what weapons there are for them in the Talmud against infidels, and what help there is for the elucidation of Scripture. If any scholar wishes to make the Talmud, in its original language, a particular study, there may be no better help for him in the world than this work of Ewald.

Many readers would pronounce the translator's introduction by far the most instructive and entertaining part of the whole book. The introduction explains that tradition of the Elders, or oral law, so often mentioned and censured in the New Testament, and which is embodied in the Talmud. The writer considers the Talmud as covering a period of about eight centuries—two centuries before Christ, and nearly six centuries after. Our previous impression was, that the Talmud was, in every sense, finished in the fifth century by the Rabbis Ashi and Abina, but we see that this writer considers Rabbi Jose as making a final slight addition to its contents in the sixth century. It was, accordingly, about two hundred years before Christ when the Rabbis began to talk in their schools about an oral law, a second law, a tradition, a Mishna, which should have traveled down to them from Sinai, in a line parallel with a line of the written law, and in the light of which

the written law shines in its true meaning, and it is inexplicable without this light. This oral law, or tradition, soon became as sacred as the Scripture of Moses. In the time of Christ the knowledge of the tradition, which must be acquired in the schools under Rabbis, was the chief thing to constitute a Jew a learned man, and draw to him the sacred admiration of the multitude. The chief study of Paul, in the school of Gamaliel, was the tradition or Mishna. The name of Paul's teacher occurs very frequently in the Talmud. We become rather intimately acquainted with Gamaliel through the Talmud. Each new century made additions to the sacredness, and even the contents, of the Mishna; and, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the persecution under the Emperor Hadrian, it began to be believed that it could not any longer be preserved in the memory, or in merely oral instruction, and that there was the most binding necessity that it be transmitted to the next generation in the form of a book. Rabbi Judah, the Holy, of Tiberias, was the man to compose this book, about the close of the second century. His book was then, and has ever since been, called the Mishna. It has always been admired for the accuracy, completeness and arrangement of its contents. No other record of Jewish tradition has ever aspired to fill its high and wide place. It went into every school as the text-book. Each different school had its peculiar comments on the Mishna. It was about the year of Christ, 270, when Rabbi Jochanan, of Jerusalem, the head of all the schools of the Holy Land, taking the Mishna of Judah for his text, wrote a commentary on it—the object of which was to collect in one work all the comments of any account in the different schools. This text and commentary constituted the Jerusalem Talmud. Its great defect was that the voice of the schools on the Euphrates was not heard in it. This defect was supplied by two distinguished Rabbis, of the schools of Babylon, Ashi and Rabina, who labored together during sixty years of the fifth century, to give the world a new and complete commentary on the Mishna of Judah, the Holy. The Mishna, as the text, and their commentary constitute the Babylonish Talmud; and when we use the unqualified term, the Talmud, we always mean this Babylonish Talmud. It has for its foundation all the Jerusalem Talmud, and an immensely wider space. The last of the two Rabbis, who prepared it in the fifth century, died near the close of that century. The whole object of these two Rabbis, in their

labors of sixty years, was to collect and incorporate in one book, with the Mishna as the text, all that had ever been taught in all the Jewish schools of the world, as sacred tradition. They built a magnificent new sepulcher for the Jewish tradition, and we may now enter their sepulcher and find their tradition just as they laid it, in wonderful preservation, a most wonderful body; and there are wonderful sounds there that are heard from the dead. The Rabbis had no doubt that when Elijah comes, he will go to that sepulcher, survey its innumerable vaults, and scrutinize every arrangement.

The learning of the Rabbis developed itself in three different directions, Masora or tradition, Kabbala, and Midrash, and each shows itself all through the Talmud. The Masora gave its chief attention to manuscripts, words, letters, and points, and every saying of the past which was connected with any thing in the Bible. The Kabbala tried to go beyond the outward, visible and limited, in God's Word, and penetrate far into the hidden, invisible, unlimited, essential and eternal truth. The Midrash was busy with allegories in the Bible. The same text had many meanings. God's Word is like the fire and hammer: who can tell the number of the sparks which fly out at one stroke? There are seventy faces to the Pentateuch. The true light of Scripture shines in the seventy languages, and in each language the color is different.

The introduction comes to a close with some account of the high estimation in which some of the Reformers held the study of the Talmud. The eulogy of John Buxtorf, the Elder, is quoted. Luther wished to advance in Hebrew, with the diligent study of Moses and David Kimchi. The similar language of other most distinguished scholars is quoted.

But we fear we have delayed too long on the outside steps. Our chief object is, with the aid of this translation, to walk into the Talmud itself, and make some kind of a short ramble through some parts of it. There are so many points in Abodah Zarah on which it would be instructive to dwell, that it is hard to make the best selection for such an article as we are now writing. We have, notwithstanding, made a selection of three points. We know that these are not the best points, but we hope to attend to the other better points on a more appropriate occasion.

The first point to which we call attention is the lesson on sacred Chronology, which we find in Abodah Zarah. Every person who makes general chronology a particular study, may be assured that

there is an immense and valuable treasure for him on the ninth leaf of this part of the Talmud. We say the ninth *leaf*, because the pages are never numbered in any Talmud, but only the leaves. The translation gives us only a very incomplete idea of the rich treasure that is on that leaf, since the translation does not include the thorough commentary of Rashi, and the other commentary. Some of the points, which Talmudic chronology considers as settled facts, are: That the world was two thousand years old in the fifty-second year of Abraham, when he first began to proclaim the truth publicly, and make an impression on his hearers; that the world was just four thousand years old in the year 172, after the destruction of the Temple by Titus; and that there were 448 years from the fifty-second year of Abraham to the Exodus, or the giving of the law. After this general statement, our limited space requires us to confine our attention to the following few lines on the instructive leaf:

TRANSLATION.—“Only one hundred and eighty years for the power of Rome over Israel after the Greeks!! No more than this!! But how has Rabbi Jose Brebi said: Persia ruled in the time of the second temple, 34 years; Greece ruled during the second temple, 180 years; the Asmoneans ruled in the period of the same temple, 103 years; the house of Herod ruled 103 years, with the temple still standing. From this time go forward and reckon the years from the destruction of the temple. In any way they are 206 years, and you have said they are only 180. But understand, 26 years the Romans stood faithful to their treaty with Israel, and did not subjugate Israel to themselves; and this is how it comes that these 26 years are not counted in the period of the domination of the wicked Empire of Rome over Israel.”

This brief extract throws a clear light on several points. First, we learn how it has come to be such a universally received saying among the Jews, that the second temple stood just 420 years. Here is the calculation: 34 years under the Medo-Persian Empire, 180 under Greeks, 103 under the Asmoneans, and 103 under the Herods—the whole being 420 years. Secondly, it is easy to see how the 2000 years are calculated from the fifty-second year of Abraham till the year 172, after the destruction of the last temple, or how the year 172 after the temple comes to be the year 4000 A. M. The calculation is from the named year of Abraham till the giving of the law, 448 years; from this last, till Solomon's

Temple, 480 years, (1 Kings vi : 1); duration of Solomon's Temple, 410 years; captivity in Babylon, 70 years; duration of second temple, 420 years; then, 172 added to the above make 2000. Thirdly, it is not difficult to perceive how the Jews count precisely one thousand years from the giving of the law till Alexander the Great, when they commenced a new era, namely : From the law till Solomon's Temple, 480; duration of this temple, 410; Babylonish captivity, 70; Persia's rule, 34; and 6 years under Alexander the Great, before the Jews commenced their new era*—all of them amounting to just 1000 years.

Hence we perceive how Hebrew Chronology makes these few lines in the Talmud one of its most essential pillars. As we inspect them, the first and chief object of amazement is that all the rule of Persia, in the time of the second temple, is set down at the low figure of 34 years. What a blunder! Amazing, indeed! We would say, utterly incredible! But here we are compelled to believe our eyes! Amazing mistake! when we know from Neh. xiii : 6, that the single Artaxerxes Longimanus reigned considerably more than 32 years. Amazing mistake! when we know that almost all chronologists place the beginning of the reign of Xerxes in the year before Christ, 485, and the death of his son, Artaxerxes Longimanus, in the year before Christ, 423, thus assigning to these two reigns fully 61 years. Amazing mistake, indeed! Please commence with Alexander the Great, when he overthrew the Persian Empire, in the final defeat of Darius Codomanus, and travel backward: we must assign to this Darius a reign of 4 years; to his immediate predecessor, Arses, 2 years; to the next predecessor, Darius Ochus, 21 years; to the next, Artaxerxes Mnemon, 46 years; to the next, Darius Nothus, whose name is the first word in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, 19 years; to his predecessor, Sogdianus, 7 months; to the next predecessor, Xerxes II, 2 months; and, accordingly, we find the line 98 years long, which runs from Alexander back, so as to cover

* There is the following anecdote in the Talmud, which is additional evidence that it is right to count these 6 years: A bill or note was brought before a court, the date on the face of which was 6 years after that time, as if, for illustration, it were presented this year, 1864, but its date is 1870. Some of the judges thought the object was to defer the beginning of the debt until 6 years later; but Nachman said he was an accurate scribe who wrote it, for he went back 6 years before the Jewish era, commencing with Alexander, to the true time of the beginning of Alexander's reign.

the last three months of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Yet the Talmud would compress these 93 years, with all of the Artaxerxes of the Nehemiah, and Xerxes, and Darius Hystaspes, and Smerdis, and the still earlier Persian Kings, into the little figure of 34 years? Who would not be amazed at such a mistake?

Let us now do what the Talmud ought to have done: give the 93 years from Alexander back to Artaxerxes, their right place, and see what assistance the Talmud may give us in identifying the sixty-nine weeks of Daniel's signal prophesy. Daniel's words are: "Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." (Dan. ix: 25.) These seven and sixty-two weeks make sixty-nine weeks. Most clearly they are not weeks of days, but of years. The sixty-nine weeks are 483 years. Keep this in mind. Now we take Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah, the Prince. We start from the year when he was thirty years of age, and when he commenced his public ministry, and travel backward: His birth was in the last year of Herod the Great, probably about fifty or sixty days before Herod's death. We, accordingly, add to the 30 in the life of Jesus, the 34 of the reign of Herod, the number which Josephus repeatedly gives us for Herod's reign. We are now back at the moment when the Asmonean dynasty expired. The Talmud is now our guide back to Persia; 103 years for the Asmoneans; 180 years for the Greeks; the first 6 years of Alexander's power, which preceded the new era of the Jews. Having now got back to the last hours of the Persian Empire, we correct the Talmud, and introduce the 93 years from the last Darius till the last year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. We add the last 37 years of this Artaxerxes, and the sum of all is 483 years—exactly sixty-nine weeks. After taking this full measure of the weeks, there are still left the first 13 years of Artaxerxes, if, according to some, he reigned 50 years, or the first three years, if he reigned about 40 years, as others compute. The conclusion, which can not be evaded, is, that if we only correct the Talmud in its prodigious blunder touching Persia, and then make it our guide in nearly all the other points, the 483 years, or sixty-nine weeks which end with the thirtieth year of Jesus, must begin at some year in the earlier half of the

reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Now, when was the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem? Let Jews and infidels give attention to this question. It was this Artaxerxes who did more than any other monarch did: he issued two mandates for the restoration of Jerusalem. In his seventh year, he sent Ezra to be Governor at Jerusalem. In his twentieth year he sent Nehemiah to be the Governor in Jerusalem, where the walls were still thrown down, and the gates consumed with fire. The sixty-nine weeks running backward from the public ministry of Jesus, terminate in that reign of one Persian monarch, which is most brilliant with commandments and commissions for the restoration of Jerusalem and good will toward the city; even, according to the Talmud itself, if only one mistake is corrected. The Talmud here easily becomes a witness against the Jews and for Jesus.

The preceding, however, we do not take to be exactly the true calculation of the sixty-nine weeks. The following appears much better: It is considered well established in Chronology that Alexander conquered Darius in the battle of Arbela, 332 years before Christ, or before the vulgar era, the common A. D., of which the proper name is the Dionysian era. Now remember Jesus was two years of age when this era commences,* that is, he was thirty years of age in the year 28 of the common A. D. Take then his thirtieth year, same as 28 A. D., and add to this the 332 years running back to the moment when Alexander became

* With the first verse of the third chapter of Luke before us: "Now in the fiftieth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar," etc., which connects the first year of Christ's public ministry with the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and is followed by the statement that Jesus was then about thirty years of age, the first idea most naturally and readily suggested is, that it is precisely the first fifteen of Tiberius and the last fifteen of Augustus, which are the first thirty years in the life of Jesus. But the last fifteen of Augustus do not run back to the death of Herod the Great, and Jesus was born certainly at least about 50 days before Herod's death. If you run back from that 19th day of August, 767 U. C., when Augustus died, sixteen full years, you have still to travel back from August to the middle of the preceding March, to reach the time when Herod died. Accordingly, we must decide that the last sixteen years of Augustus, and the first fourteen of Tiberius, make the first thirty years in the life of Jesus, and that when Tiberius had finished fourteen years, the age of Jesus was thirty years and some months. The death of Augustus is placed in our A. D. 14, but clearly it ought to have been 16, at least, and need not be more than sixteen. So our A. D. 14 is 16 in the life of Jesus, and our A. D. 28 is the true 30 of the life of Jesus, and the first great year of his public ministry. The statements of this note are sustained by abundant facts.

the master of Persia; then add to this the 98 years from Alexander back to Artaxerxes Longimanus; then add to this the last 30 years of this Artaxerxes, and we have exactly the sixty-nine weeks or 483 years; and if Artaxerxes reigned 50 years, which is the computation of the ablest scholars, we stop with the full measure of the weeks precisely at his twentieth year—the very year when he sent Nehemiah with the commandment and commission to restore and build Jerusalem. Hengstenberg argues with great force that the reign of Artaxerxes was 50 years, and he finds the very same sixty-nine weeks on a perfectly independent parallel line. He quotes the assertion of Thucydides that when Themistocles fled to Persia, Artaxerxes was then newly on the throne. This flight of Themistocles is placed in the year 473 before Christ, and one year earlier, that is 474, must be about the time when Artaxerxes ascended the throne. If this was his first year, his twentieth year was about 455 before Christ, same as 299 of the city of Rome; add to this sixty-nine weeks, or 483, and the result is 782 u. c.—the very year of the city of Rome, when Tiberius was in his fifteenth year, and when, according to the record of the Evangelist Luke, Jesus was in the first year of his public ministry, being about thirty years of age.* (See Luke iii: 1.) These last two calculations are two lines perfectly independent of each other, and having no particular fact in common, while they measure the same exact sixty-nine weeks from the public ministry of Jesus back to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. If the public ministry of Jesus lasted only three years and a half, this is just half a week, and, accordingly, in the middle of the seventieth week, the great atonement was made, and the sacrifices at the temple were no longer valuable. Most wonderfully does the prophesy of Daniel suit the facts in the life of Christ, and in the earliest history of the Church.

* A calculation very satisfactory; and Hengstenberg could have identified the sixty-nine weeks in another way. Here he has the twentieth year of Artaxerxes in the year 455 before Christ; add to this the 28 of our era, reaching to the thirtieth year of Jesus, and here are the 483, or sixty-nine weeks. Hengstenberg, however, is pleased to present a calculation as above, which is not in any way entangled with what he calls the difficult question of the year of the birth of Jesus. The Germans universally, as far as I know, place the birth of Jesus four years before our era. Let them make it two years and they get at the truth, as we confidently allege can be clearly proved.

This mistake of the Talmud in assigning only 34 years to the Persian Empire, is probably the worst mistake of the kind in all history. First. It does injustice to Christianity. The most reliable history clearly gives to the evidences of Christianity, the fact that there were sixty-nine weeks of years between the fifteenth year of Tiberius and the earlier years of Artaxerxes; but while this mistake is not corrected, it is impossible to see this fact. Secondly. It does injustice to Daniel as a prophet. While it stands without correction, there is a prophecy in Daniel which can not ever be explained. No Jew knows what this prophecy means. To find the seventy weeks by counting the 70 years of the captivity with the 420 years of the second temple, is to give them their beginning from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and not from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem. We add, thirdly, that this mistake does injustice to the chronology of the world. It is an act of injustice to all the race of man. It is a question of great interest to every human being, how long man has been on the face of the earth. The mistake we are considering, leads to a false answer, and, in consequence of it, every Jew misses by a great space the right number of the years of the world. If the 34 years and about 177 more had been assigned to the Persian Empire, as is required by both the Bible and the best profane history, then it would have been clear that the year of the world 4000 comes before the destruction of the second temple, and not 172 years later.

Jews and Christians have very nearly the same chronology for the other ages of the world. The year 1864 is, in the current Jewish chronology, A. M. 5624; and as they place the destruction of the temple in the year 3828, they reckon back, from the present, 1796 years to the end of the temple. Now, if we subtract this from 1864, we see that they place the destruction of the temple in our A. D. 68. We generally place it in 71: all the difference only 3 years. Start now from the commencement of our current Anno Domini 36 years after Herod became king of Judea, and count back, as the Talmud does, 103 for the Asmoneans, 180 for the Greeks, and then the first 6 years of Alexander which are not in these 180; and the whole sum is 325 from our era back to Alexander. We have just been counting it 332: the whole difference only 7 years. And it was because these 7 years were out, that in a previous calculation, with the Talmud as our guide, we fell on the thirteenth

year of Artaxerxes: if they had been in, we would have fallen just where Hengstenberg does, and where the other calculation landed us, namely, on the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. The Talmud's great mistake is the 34 years for the Persian Empire, and it was the capital mistake, the very best, to shut out the light completely from Daniel's prophesy, and obscure and hide the fact that when Jesus did enter on his public ministry, it was the time—according to our best calculations the time to the very year—when Daniel had said the Messiah the Prince should appear after the going forth of the command to restore and build Jerusalem.

We have chosen for the *second* topic of the present article, the light in which the Talmud looks at the bread and wine of Gentiles. The Talmud treats the wine of the heathen as if all the worst abominations of idolatry were centered in it. It is amazing to learn the particular and almost unlimited regulations touching the use of wine. When a catalogue is given of those articles of property among Gentiles which the Jew is never allowed to use, and which he dare not even sell to any person, wine is made the very first in the long catalogue. It is inferred from the verse: "Which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink-offerings" (Deut. xxxii: 38), that the sacrifices of the heathen and their wine are placed on the same level, and that as a Jew never can partake of an idolatrous sacrifice or even sell any part of it to another, so all wine among the Gentiles is utterly prohibited to the Jews. The prohibition of all wine offered to idols is of such tremendous potency, that its remote circle includes all wine except what is made by Jews. Only look at the catalogue of those things which themselves are utterly forbidden either for use or for sale, and if any part of them mixes in any other thing, all is forbidden: here are mentioned the idol, the ox which the law required to be stoned, the birds sacrificed in the purification of the leper, the hair of the Nazarite, the meat which has been cooked in milk, the goat which was sent from the temple as loaded with the sins of the people on the great day of atonement; but the thing which is mentioned before all these and first of all, is the wine dedicated to the idol.

Rabbi Asi said in the name of two Rabbis preceding him, that there are three kinds of wine. First. There is the wine dedicated to an idol; this must not be tasted by any Jew, it can not be sold, and he dare not keep in his pocket the money received for it. If

he carries as much of it as the weight of an olive he is unclean, even if he has not touched it. Secondly. There is the wine prepared by those who are not Jews, but it is not dedicated to an idol: both its use and sale are prohibited to a Jew: still it has a much less power of pollution than the other. Thirdly. There is the wine prepared by Jews, but kept by Gentiles. This wine the Jew dare not drink, but he may make profit out of it.

It is clear from these extracts that wine was viewed as the eminent symbol of religious concord and fellowship—of oneness in faith and oneness in heart. To enter the house of an idolater and drink the wine on his table for which he had given thanks to his idol, was considered one of the most inconsistent and unlawful acts ever committed by a Jew. To drink wine with another was the indication that you were his sacred friend, that you believed in his god, and worshiped and prayed as he did. The Jews abhorred the wine of the heathen, just as they did their idols. They have the same aversion to the wine of our Lord's Supper that they have to Jesus.

Bread is not the same strong symbol of religious fellowship that wine is, still it is so strong that a Jew must not eat the bread of Gentiles; he may, however, sell it. One Rabbi asserts, in the name of Rabbi Jochanan, that no court (house of judgment) has ever allowed the eating of the bread of Gentiles. From this it is inferred that possibly there was some individual who allowed it. Let us examine. When Rabbi Dimi came from Palestine, he brought this story, that once a Rabbi went out in a field and a Gentile brought him a large beautiful loaf. He said: How beautiful is this bread! Why have the Rabbis prohibited it? It is strange that he asked why the Rabbis had prohibited it: he certainly knew the reason was that the eating of the bread of Gentiles would lead to proposals of marriage with them: but what he really asked, must have been why he could not purchase bread from a Gentile out in the open field where there was nothing to lead to any proposal of marriage. The inference is not warranted that he ever allowed the bread of Gentiles to Jews. Others tell this story differently, namely, that once a Rabbi came to a city with his disciples, and observed that they were out of bread; he inquired: Is there no baker here? Some thought he inquired after a heathen baker, and so made the bread of such lawful, but this was not so; it was after a Jewish baker that he inquired. Rabbi Chilbo says: That teacher who allowed heathen bread, allowed

it only where there is no Jewish baker, but where there is such a baker it is prohibited. Rabbi Jochanan says: That teacher who allowed heathen bread, allowed it only out in the field, but not within the city, where a sociability might start with it leading to a proposal of marriage. And there is doubt whether this is the correct statement; for a certain Jew, named Ibu, once secretly checked his hunger with Gentile bread in the open field, and when it was found out, either Rabba, as some say, or Nachman, son of Isaac, as others think, said to the people: Speak not with this Ibu, because he has eaten Gentile bread.

These facts clearly prove that bread and wine were the established impressive and universally acknowledged symbols of sacred friendship, or oneness in faith and oneness in heart. The Jews viewed the bread and wine of the heathen, and especially the latter, as closely connected with idolatry. According to the sacredness of their own wine which came to their altar in Jerusalem, was their abhorrence of the wine offered to idols. This makes it clearer why the friends of Peter, of the circumcision, censured him that he went in to men uncircumcised and did eat with them. This explains why Peter in Antioch, when the strenuous Jews from James had come, was afraid to eat with the Gentiles as he had been doing, and Paul charged him with inconsistency in withdrawing himself. This question of the lawful use of the wine and meat sold in the heathen market, troubled the Church of Corinth and almost every church; hence, Paul in different Epistles gave his judgment on both the inherent lawfulness and the rule of expediency and charity. This same question was prominently in the minds of the embittered Jews when they almost tore the Apostle in pieces in a court of the temple.

Further, the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper must be viewed in the same light: they are, on that table, the symbols of sacred friendship, oneness in faith and oneness in heart. Jesus had special regard to the symbolical meaning which past ages had given them, when he gave them their place in his last supper. The wine is consecrated to Jesus, and to drink it is the profession of oneness with him. The meaning which this bread and wine have from the customs and associations of the Jews in all ages, is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one family, one brotherhood, one blessing, one thanksgiving, one and the same strength, one conflict, one victory, one hope of eternal life.

"*The letter killeth,*" so wrote the apostle Paul, and when did he

ever write a sentence containing more profound universal and awful truth? Any religion which is only a religion of the letter is dead, and leads men to death. By the letter, Paul meant any religion which governs the outer man, and which may have a perfect system of rules for the outer man, but it does not possess the soul or penetrate through the innermost man. A religion of the letter is any religion which may give the man's body every rule that it needs; which requires all rightful obedience from the ears, the head, the eyes, the lips, the hands and the feet; which may have its strict rules of Taste not, Touch not—what may be eaten and what cups may come to the lips, and it may have its multitude of rules for fasts and feasts, the forms and the times of prayers and blessings; it may require of the feet many stated visits to the place where the altar is, and it may require the lips to utter there many of the best prayers that have ever been written; it may prescribe excellent orthodoxy and outward morality: but it fails to give the man a new heart, and leaves him a stranger to spiritual regeneration. Any religion is the letter which killeth, if it omits the great lesson, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." It may place on the man the most gorgeous livery of heaven, but it leaves him in his innermost being still the child of hell.

When Paul uttered the words, "*The letter killeth*," he did it with the great fact before him that his own nation, the Jews, in their rejection of Jesus and opposition to Christianity, in their hope of a temporal deliverer and increasing zeal for their temple, their forms of worship, their isolation from other nations, and their Rabbinic laws, were changing and degrading the holy religion of patriarchs and prophets—the religion of which they were the distinguished heirs—into a religion of the mere letter. We may consider his words as a prophesy, "*The letter killeth*." It was the same as declaring to the Jews that they were killing the religion of patriarchs and prophets—that they were putting away from them all the life of the religion of their fathers. Have subsequent ages proved the prophesy true? Has the religion of the Jews proved itself ever since, before the eyes of all nations, a religion wonderfully dead? Is there all through the immense structure of the Talmud, sounding along every wall and reverberating from every arch, the ring of that awful death which Paul pronounced on the letter? Does this death become more and more visible and

offensive as Rabbinism travels on toward us from the last temple, in an increasing divergence from Christianity?

We will select some of the excellent things in the Jewish Scriptures, and show how the whole work of the letter toward them, or we might say, the whole work of the Talmud toward them, has been killing. Take first that most Divine principle, the Unity of God: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord." That same letter which the apostle condemns, has made the Unity of God among the Jews the same thing essentially that it is among Mahomedans. It has become such a Unity that there is no Holy Spirit, one with God, which He puts into His people as the prophets promised—no Holy Spirit which God pours out upon all flesh, and is the life of the Church—no creation of a new heart or new and heavenly birth of the innermost man by the power of this Spirit. A religion with no Holy Ghost is dead.

Again, we will select the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and show how there has been on this command the killing influence of the letter. Already had this influence gone far in its destructive work when the Jews came to Jesus with the question, "Who is my neighbor?" It was disputed among them whether the Samaritan could be their neighbor. The doubt whether the Samaritan could be their neighbor, whom they should love as themselves, was itself a wound going to the very heart of their religion. The Talmud shows us in what principles and maxims such doubts landed them in the ages following. Rabbi Joseph chose to expound the place where it is said that one shall neither throw heathens nor Jewish shepherds of small cattle into danger, nor shall he deliver them from danger, in this way, that he may for a price deliver them from danger, to the end not to bring on himself their hatred. There are three words which come together in the Talmud, *Minin*, *Mesuroth* and *Meshumadim*, and may be translated *heretics*, *betrayers* and *apostates*, and when these words are used they always refer especially to Jews who have embraced Christianity. Now notice some of the directions in the Talmud in relation to these heretics, betrayers and apostates, which are the words to designate Christian Jews. One rule is, let a man drive them into danger, but let him never rescue them from danger. One of the Rabbis of the Talmud says: If one of them has fallen into a pit where there is a kind of stairs on which he may climb up out of the pit, then destroy the stairs immediately, and make it your excuse that you

were afraid an animal of yours would get down on the stairs. Another says: If there is a stone for the top of a well which has been removed, and one of these persons has fallen into the well, then put the stone on the top immediately while he is below, and make it your excuse that you must drive your beasts close by it, and it needed to be covered. A Rabbi says: If there is a ladder in the pit where the man has fallen, which might help him to get out, then get the ladder away immediately, and make it your excuse that you wanted to get your child down from the roof, where it was in danger of falling. The true law of love to our neighbors can hardly be found breathing under such weights of rubbish as this.

Again, the command to remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy, has itself been blasted by the letter that killeth. It was this same letter which produced such blindness of the Jews that they could hardly see the great truth that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, or that man's welfare is above the Sabbath, and is the higher and ultimate end to which the Sabbath looks up. They manifested this blindness when they indignantly accused Jesus that he had on the Sabbath given sight to a man who had been born blind. We wonder at the superstition of this objection: but there is a line running from this fact straight forward through the later ages of the Talmud, on which there are fixed many just such blazing facts. The story is in the Talmud, that there was once in the house of Rabbi Samuel, a servant girl, in whose eye an inflammation commenced on the Sabbath; she complained the whole day, but no person paid any attention to her, and on the next morning her eye was out of its place in her head; and from that event Samuel ordained that a man might apply a cure to a disease of the eye on the Sabbath, if there was danger of the loss of the eye. The question is asked in the Talmud, what diseases of the eye may be cured on the Sabbath? Rabbi Judah answers, an eye that has an issue, a wounded eye, a bloodshot eye and an inflamed eye. When the disease of the eye is beginning, or when the eye is already better, it is not permitted to apply a cure on the Sabbath. According to these rules, as the man was blind from his birth, Jesus ought not to have applied the clay to his eyes on the Sabbath. All these Talmudic directions touching the Sabbath, proclaim the fact that the letter has already killed.

Through all the immense structure of the Talmud, on every wall

and in every dark corner, the truth is before us that the letter killeth. It required thirty years of close labor to write the first copy of the Talmud, and we may view it all as one sermon of the length of thirty years on the text: "*The letter killeth.*" If these words were written at the head of every page of the Talmud, it would be a singular page indeed in which there would not be something pointing up directly to the words at the head. How appropriate the reflection that it is just as true in the Christian Church as among the Hebrews, that the letter killeth! Even if the name of Christ is in the letter, nevertheless, if it is the mere letter, it killeth. Genuflections, attention to all prescribed prayers, fasts and feasts, daily worship, payment of debts, outward morality, religious intelligence, and all the other things of a perfect outward religion, never of themselves make the living Christian. All men are spiritually dead except where there is the new heart, the work of the Holy Spirit. As circumcision is of the heart, so the true baptism is of the Spirit, not of water.

When Ishmael, the son of Jose, was dangerously sick, he gave his friends, according to their request, some historical items which he had received from his father, to be preserved by them as highly valuable. One of them has already been mentioned repeatedly, that 180 years before the end of the second temple the wicked Rome extended the arm of her domination over Israel. Another item was, that eighty years before the temple's destruction the wise men of Israel decreed the impurity or uncleanness of the land of Gentile nations, and that glass vessels came under the laws of religious impurity if they were touched by any unclean person, or reptile, or beast. Observe that this new decree of impurity touching all lands except the land of Israel, and glass vessels or cups, has its date eighty years before the temple's destruction, and accordingly close to the time of the birth of Jesus. And as we reflect on this date, we are appropriately reminded of another fact that occurred about forty years later, or about the middle of the period between that decree and the destruction of the temple. This fact is the vision of Peter on the housetop in Joppa, when the Great Sea was under his eye to the West. A great sheet, knit at the four corners, descended from heaven, and came down so as to reveal all that was on it to the apostle's eye, and on it were all lands of Gentile nations, and all the Gentile nations with all their unclean glass and all other pollution—"all manner of four-footed

beasts of the earth, and wild beasts and creeping things and fowls of heaven;" and when Peter felt as if he could not touch such uncleanness, the voice from heaven said to him, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." Three times Peter heard that God had cleansed all that was before him, and then the sheet was taken back into heaven. These two facts, separated by about forty years, may well be called most suggestive representative facts. The earlier is the excellent miniature of the Talmudic system; the later is the finest miniature of Christianity. The earlier fact pointed out the road in which anti-Christian Judaism has ever since been traveling; the fact at Joppa pointed out the road in which true Christianity started out, never to turn back. We may identify in the earlier fact the capital principle of Rabbinic development; and in the later fact we may identify the central principle of Christian development and life. There is in the earlier fact the germ of all the Talmud, and there is in Peter's vision the true germ of Christendom. In that decree of Rabbinic sages, we see a greater darkness of impurity settling down on all lands of the Gentiles; but in that vision of Peter, we see all heathen lands cleansed by the holy blood of Calvary so as to have a right to claim the preaching of the gospel to every creature. In that decree we see the Jews trying to separate themselves more and more from the Gentiles, and practically saying, *Let me be further from you; come not near me, for I am holier than thou*; but in Peter's vision we see the wall of separation falling instantly, and Christian Jews going forth to embrace, in the arms of love, all the heathen world. In that decree we see the growing solicitude about the cleanness of the outside of the cup, and it appears to have been such a solicitude about vessels of glass as was something new in Israel; but in Peter's vision we identify the principle that it is more the words going out from the heart at the lips, that defile the man, than any cups coming to the lips; and that it is the heart, the inner man, which most needs to be cleansed. In that decree, which has its place eighty years before the temple's destruction, we see the glorious moon, which was shining high in heaven during a long night, now sinking to the earth, and touching the ground, and even falling below the ground, and the moment becomes unusually dark to all lands; but in that apostolic vision, forty years later, we see the new sun rising in the East, which the world never saw before, and sending its beams to every habitation of man.

ART. VII.—*The Divine Origin and Supremacy of Civil Government.*

AMONG the premonitory symptoms of that decay that is now preying upon our country's vitals, and which will ultimately paralyze it in death, unless arrested, was, and is a constantly increasing disrespect for law, and legal forms, and a chafing under its restraints. Disrespect for law, whether it be physical, mental, moral, or civil, is the sure precursor of decline, in whatever phase it may appear. There is no true patriot, who has not been pained at the eruptions of this deep-seated disease in the body politic, in the form of mobs, that have been a burning stigma upon the land. The disease has not been located in any particular member or members of the body, but has permeated the entire system. In the rebellious States, negro Slavery has been the core around which the *pus* has gathered, which is now suppurating in the form of a terrible rebellion. The remark has often been made, and nowhere more frequently than at the South (for here its truth is most apparent), that the worst blight of Slavery falls upon the South herself. The wide chasm between the laborer and proprietor, destroys that happy adjustment of power, so essential to the preserving of society from despotism and monarchy on the one hand, and lawlessness, in the name of popular sovereignty, on the other. But when we turn to the other side, the loyal States, we find the disease there again gathering around that irritating core, Slavery, and suppurating, in many instances, in lawless attempts to get rid of it. And so Slavery has been as productive of disease in both parts, as a grain of sand in the eye of unceasing pain and irritation. It matters not whether it be lawless efforts to defend Slavery against those assailing it, or whether it be lawlessly attacking it; the demoralization is the same, for it is not right to use unjustifiable means for the attainment even of good.

We may as well open our eyes to the foreboding fact, that the whole body is diseased, that the whole heart is sick, and both are struggling to be relieved of their own corruptions. We discover its outworkings in the loyal States, in the resistance of constituted authority, as in the mob in New York, in dangerous secret combinations, dangerous symptoms of lawlessness, like smoking flax, only waiting a breeze to flame. And its tendency is as much

more dangerous than that in the South, as conspiracy is in crime above rebellion.

We will try to enumerate, briefly, what seems to us some of the causes leading to this state of affairs: and one of the most vicious is that infidel, superficial and degrading theory of the origin of civil government, that puts it on no higher ground than a mere convenient adjustment of communities for protection and profit. A theory essentially atheistic, and whose necessary consequence is anarchy, as is every arrangement that has no God in it.

We have imbibed the notion from our statesmen, that government is a sort of compact among men, instead of an eternal principle, and whatever its form may be it is a modification of the same principle, and it is the working of this principle that makes it even possible for them to be compacted together. Without it you could no more league men together, for any purpose, than you could confederate a heap of sand. The fable of the eleven oxen confederating themselves together to resist the attacks of a neighboring lion, is the history of the origin and end of civil government on this theory. Nay, we owe the beasts an apology for thus caricaturing them. Their instincts are not so superficial and senseless; even they obey a necessity of their nature, to be gregarious, which they never acquired by their own efforts, but is the impress of their Creator, even as matter, by a necessity of its nature, is attracted inversely as the square of its distances.

The sooner the world cracks the nut, and finds the kernel of civil government, the better it will be for mankind, civilization and religion. As it now is, infidelity gives them the husk, and bids them live, and be in health. What has the idea of civil government, being a compact, done for us? It has hatched in our own bosom the monstrous prodigy of secession and anarchy. Government is a compact, say they, and all the disaffected members have to do, is to withdraw from the body, until a limbless trunk will alone remain to die of sheer exhaustion, reproducing, on a splendid scale, the secession of the limbs from the stomach; and the nation, adopting the suggestion, would be left to write the moral in her own blood, that has oft been written of those systems that ignore God. Any system of government that can not point to a Divine progenitor is futile. The poet Coleridge, on hearing a friend descant on the probabilities of an infidel system of philanthropy regenerating the world, plucked a thistle down,

and flung it to the winds, saying: "The tendency of this down is to China, but I know, certainly, it will never get there; but after a few gyrations, it will fall near the place where it started. So government born outside of the Divine Mind, will perish upon the lap that gave it birth."

It must be a source of shame and wonder, that our Constitution, the embodiment of our system, has no mention of God in it. How in this its power is weakened, what bad morals it teaches the young offspring to be born and reared under its protecting ægis? And bitterly are we reaping the effects of its implied atheism, as well as presenting to the world the astounding fact of a Constitution ignoring the only source of its power, without which not a single wheel of its machinery would ever move upon its pinions.

A system ignoring God, and yet so dependent on him, that not a hand can touch this ark of our liberties without a solemn oath by him to insure fidelity in the exercise of its functions. If we would perpetuate civil government, we must educate the moral sense of its citizens; we must put the violations of its laws first in the domain of conscience, where this primary minister of justice will punish those infringements before they become overt, which, though they will ultimately lead to, as yet are not within its grasp. The resisting and upturning of it is not only a sin on account of its effects of derangement and ruin, but an absolute sin against God. When the Psalmist came to a review of his great sin in breaking the law, in violating its sanctity in the rights it secured to the citizen; when all this came up before him, we do not hear his confession hinging on the wrong he had inflicted on *Uriah*, his duplicity, his ingratitude to a faithful subject; but rising above these he bemoaned the fact that it, at last, was all against God: against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned and done this great evil in Thy sight. And while it is always incumbent upon us to correct the abuses of the government by its functionaries in bad legislation, or in the wresting of good laws to bad ends; for mal legislation, or administration, is no more a part of the Divine ordinance of civil government than sin, and it is as much our duty to uproot the one as to conserve the other; yet while this is true, its very abuses must be corrected according to appointed order; so that it shall not be paralyzed under the shock. For government, like the human body, is arranged to repair its own injuries and correct its own humors; and, as in the body, all act on the principle in

effecting cure, *to assist nature*; so in civil derangements, all that is required is to start and uphold its dormant, or impeded functions, and it will cure itself. Not a jot further than this can we go without being conspirators against God himself; for he who arrays himself against the laws of God, whether mental, moral, civil, or physical, seeks to destroy almost the only way by which God manifests himself to the world; that is, by His government of it. One part of the mission of the Saviour into the world was to vindicate and give supremacy to law and government. Not only moral government, but civil too; which is, in some sense, an off-spring of God's moral government. The germs of its existence are here; there could be no such thing as criminal law for the defense of property, reputation, or life, without it; for those moral distinctions in which criminal law is grounded, would be wanting. The laws against theft and arson, suppose the fact that these are understood already and blamed as being wrongs against moral obligation. And there is no way of defining these crimes and bringing them to judgment, except by reference to those distinctions that lie in the domain of moral government. Take, for example, murder; we can not punish it, or define it, until we enter the territories of moral government; we define it as killing with malice aforethought, done with a consciously criminal intent. Civil society is a chimera when divorced from moral government. Without it, we are not above the race of pismires. We have no moral and religious ideas, and can not legislate. Civil society and government is impossible, and all that is genial and benign in the State is lost. If your house is burned, you only conceive of it as a loss, and not a crime. If your children are killed, you are in the condition of the bees, when their hive is rifled; only mad with a sense of loss, but no sense of the crime or wrong.

Or to illustrate further, take our civil provisions to protect virtue; unless you travel over into the moral domain, what value are they? Without our moral allegiance, licentiousness is no more harm than hunger. But this is enough to show that even the humiliation and sacrifice of Christ was to maintain honor, and magnify all law, at whatever point it was broken, or infringed. And hence we find Him just as careful to uphold and support the civil government while on earth, as the moral; nay, it was impossible to divorce them; He pays tribute; He enjoins obedience to the civil ruler, and yields Himself an example of submission to an illegal

arrest; and rebukes His disciple for drawing his sword against it, even in his own defense. We are told by theologians that there was something in the nature of things that made it necessary for God to sacrifice His son. But we confess it is not clear to us. We can not see that any could have called the Judge of all the earth to an account if He had pardoned every sinner that breathes, without any sacrifice. Who would have dared to say what doest thou? So, with becoming deference, the Lord Jesus humbled himself and died, to magnify the law and make it honorable; the whole law; no matter in what division, whether mental, moral, civil, or physical, in whatever phase it has been wrested by transgression from its original design, the control, development, and perfection of man, its subject.

In every being there are certain marks of life. If man lives physically he breathes, mentally he thinks; morally, conscience holds her blazing torch, discriminating between right and wrong, and mutters wrathfully in the soul, when her dictates are unheeded; so, if there is a God, there are certain characteristics of His being; and it seems to us most of those characteristics are comprehended in His government, at least so far as we know. Now, laws are the means by which government is attained as an end. God governs by laws. Law is the mode in which a cause acts; moral laws, mental laws, and civil laws, are the modes in which intelligent causes act. It seems, therefore, to us conclusive that moral, mental, civil, and physical laws are the modes by which God, the *great cause*, acts through and upon us to the attainment of the *great end*, the government of the world. If this be so, how inevitable and startling the conclusion: that they who violate or infringe any of these laws, the *modes in which God acts* in the attainment of the great end, the government of the world, conspire against God, aiming at His very existence. We know it becomes us to speak with great modesty on such a subject; but with us the conviction is irresistible. We will illustrate. It is a law of matter, "that every particle in the universe attracts every other by a power which diminishes as the square of the distances between the particles increase." Now, whoever would invert or subvert this order or mode of Divine action, whereby the physical universe is governed, and worlds are kept harmoniously in their places, is a conspirator against God, seeking to obliterate His image from the world, which is reflected in the order and adjustment of means to

ends, and would destroy the tracings of the Almighty in the work of His hands.

When God created man, it was in His own image. "In the image of God created He him." This word image seems to us to be the kernel of all government, at least as far as our knowledge extends. The image of God in man is not only reason, will, or the intellectual faculties, nor does it consist alone in the right use of these, but also impressing him with a capacity for government: God manifesting His own being in man by impressing His own eternal principles of order upon him, as the seal leaves its image on the wax. It is remarked by Bush on these words, and it is but the reiteration of the opinion of other commentators, "That while the image of God implies likeness to Him in moral attributes, as is intimated in Col. iii: 10, there can be as little doubt that the phrase in this connection denotes primarily the possession of dominion and authority. This is evinced by the words of the ensuing clause, 'let them have dominion,' which is to be regarded as explanatory of the term image in the first clause." Then the primary idea of the image of God in man is dominion, authority, not only over the animal creation, but in that ability to construct laws and execute them for his own government in the community and State. The image of God in man is seen in that tendency of his nature to society, and the devising of laws to regulate himself in this capacity. And hence man upon earth represents or bears the image of God nearly in the same sense in which the governor of a province is said to represent or bear the image of his sovereign. To illustrate: We believe there is a sense in which the physical man is made in the image of God. It reflects the Divine skill; it is a monument in its exquisite adaptation, in its wondrous functions, of the omniscience and omnipotence of God. The poet Ovid has drawn a true portraiture in these lines:

"While mute creation downward bend
Their sight, and to their earthly mother tend,
Man looks aloft, and with erected eyes
Beholds his own hereditary skies!"

Now, let man violate any of these physical laws of his being, and he is guilty of conspiracy against God's government and his own happiness; he is arresting the progress of his being, and introducing anarchy into the government of God; seeking to

destroy God's image in him. And how soon a troop of ills, the avengers of his treason, come down upon him with frightful swoop! Or take his mental nature, where the image of God is not questioned, and they that violate these laws conspire against the government of a world. They rise in their rebellion to the very throne of God, shattering His image in His own temple, and as certain as thought rises out of the depths of the mind, specters will haunt them, reason will reel on its throne, and the functions of their bodies will run as wild as an engine unbelted from the friction and regulated motion of a thousand wheels.

But we go a step further, and here, if we have reasoned correctly, we have now attained the point we have desired to establish. There is a government resting on even stronger basis, which we call civil. It rests on all the others as its piers. They are the arches for its support. It commands to its aid all their accumulated authority. It is an eclectic, selecting out of all the rest the elements peculiar to its own nature, each chosen element bringing with it the sanctity and authority of the system from whence it was taken, and when civil government spreads over us its sheltering wings, it demands our loyalty by the authority of all the systems from whence its component elements were selected.

We speak of God's moral, physical and mental governments. These are the systems by which God governs mind, soul and matter. Their laws are the adjustment for the attainments of these ends, the means by which God manifests Himself to and in the world. Now, civil government is the aggregate of these same laws; so adjusted that they reach from the individual, and clasp communities and States in their embrace. They assume more general application, and are called civil. But they are the modes by which an intelligent and beneficent God deals with States, and have the awful sanctity of all the rest, and the violation of which is conspiracy against all the rest in one form or other, as well as an attack against the entire government of God in all its systems.

And how do we arrive at this conclusion? On this wise:

The moral law, written at first in the heart of man, no one will dare deny, is the image of God. Now, we have from Sinai a transcript of that law, and in this we have the entire elementary principles of civil law. Every feature of it may be found in one form or other in that decalogue. For example, we have there a bill of rights: One man shall not wrong another in his life, property, or

character; and were it necessary, the whole system might be evolved. Now, they who *attack* civil government, either with a view to its ultimate overthrow, or breaking any of its laws, can be viewed in no other light than conspirators against government, both civil and moral, lifting their puny arms to smite down the image of God.

And that this is true, is evident in the fact, that the murderer is charged with the destruction of God's image. Murder falls in the category of civil crime, but it runs directly over into the moral system, in the reason assigned for the execution of the murderer: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He him." He that mars or shivers that image, strikes through his victim at God, and true to this conception that the image of God in the world is his government, and the execution of its various laws, God orders in the Israelitish government to be set aside those four cities of refuge, into which the one charged with murder might flee for safety, to escape the avenger of blood. This in that system was a provision extraordinary for peculiar cases.

Now, what is most remarkable about this provision is, that there is no real need for it. The persons involved were not by the law guilty. They were not murderers, but those who by accident had taken the lives of others. They could, in our code, have been discharged by a court of inquiry; a justice's court. Then why this necessity? God had a government to sustain over that commonwealth, and while He would give protection to the innocent, He would make their very deliverance teach the supremacy of law, and proclaim its awful sacredness. He, though not guilty of murder, was, in his misfortune, made a teacher of a fearful lesson to others; his life for a time is in as much danger as if a criminal; that his fellow-citizens beholding it, might exclaim, how dreadful it is to violate the laws of man and God when one who is innocent is treated thus!

Here is one point in which the Jewish system of civil law is superior to all others. It had two ideas ever in distinct view in its execution: first, the protection of the public interests and punishment of crimes; and second, it was didactic in its *modus operandi*, conveying the highest moral impressions.

And here is a radical defect in our system. Take, for example, the administration of the oath, which is almost vital to our system,

nothing can be accomplished without it. Yet the oath is administered usually in so perfunctory and farcical a manner that it is no wonder it is treated so lightly, and practical infidelity and atheism will obstruct our very vitals unless this abuse is arrested. There is no solemnity or any moral impression made in the exercise of this, most sacred function; so that public morals are undermined and vitiated on this subject, until it sometimes looks as if there is not soundness and veracity enough in the nation to perpetuate its existence. Perjury outright is a matter of every-day life; and communities have ceased even to scowl at it. Oaths are taken for every pretext, until the Government seems to be paying a bonus for perjury. Nay, perjury itself, if accomplished by mental reservations, perfidy, or that devilish smartness whereby an oath is shorn of its power, is now laughed at, as a smart jest. Men and women, unrebuked, talk of taking an oath; and ignoring its obligations, because disliking the power administering, to subserve some selfish interest, go and take the oath, and then declare it null, because they were compelled to take it. And why all this? Oh! it is the ruins of the temple of government falling upon us, because its pillars have been removed by wicked hands.

"When the foundations are removed, what shall the righteous do?" These are the death strides on a nation's life, the death blossoms of her decay, until there remains no hope but in gaining the right, placing law on the throne, and crowning it in the name of the Most High, and then forever maintaining it there, by might and right, against all its foes. It were better for a nation that one-half its inhabitants should fall; nay, that its soil should glisten with the whitening bones of its slain—that the other half should be reduced to want—that the forest should reconquer its territory, and that the wild beast should again make his lair where once its fields were graced with the golden sheaves of abundant harvest; that Neptune should blockade Eolus in his cave, and not a breath should stir to rustle a sail, and its navies should rot in port, and all commerce should cease from ocean, land and river, than its government should be overthrown, or even totter; or that its laws should become impotent to control its citizens. An outraged people might, by the ballot, or even by the sword, hurl every executive from his throne of power. They might strangle tyranny with their own hands, and fill the sacred places with better men, and still the system and principles of government would remain intact.

This would be a great calamity—great in proportion to the violence or irregularity with which it was done. But after the system had recovered the shock, all would be harmony and health again.

When a nation is struggling for its existence, all the calamities of war may come, and hope remain. The father might fall in the struggle, cheered, even in death, with the thought that his children might enjoy peace and security under good government as the reward of his death. But if government, even though defective, perish from a nation (for, like our mortality, we possess it but once), human hopes lie buried in its ruin; civilization wraps itself as the shroud around its body; religion begs a burial in the same sepulcher. Tyrants may fetter government; they may restrain the free exercise of its members; they may infect it with disease; nay, array it in its death-robcs, but if the spark of life is not extinct, it will, in time, arise, like a giant refreshed with wine, shaking itself out of its fetters, as the lion shakes the dew of morning from his mane. But if it is rent in fragments, or its cohesion destroyed, or even the fatal elements of dismemberment injected into its life, then we may come and weep over its grave. But it will not live again. We may, like those devoted virgins, who went up and down the world in quest of the dismembered limbs of Osiris, seek to join its remains, but we will be impotent to inspire these disjointed members with life again. The mirror, from which is reflected the image of God in the world, will be broken, and neither finite head nor hand shall conjoin its fragments. Let us not forget that when the civil government of a nation is destroyed, that the image of God in the world is gone; for mental, moral and civil government are so intimately connected, that they go down in the same crash. Who is so insane as to hope to subvert civil order, and conserve religion and civilization? What is the experience of this hour? As well crush the limbs of your body and expect the head not to feel the shock, or the heart not to swoon or grow sick.

Government, says a great writer, is the exponent of a nation's civilization, and, we might add, its religion too. It is not enacted for society, but the outworking of the instincts of society. If it is arbitrary, or if a tyrant sways its scepter with freedom's image under his feet, it is because he is the ruler of a people only fit for a tyrant to govern. If the laws are corrupt or unexecuted, it is

because corruption has first invaded the people. Law is the development of civilization. This is a great idea, dug from the ruins of dead empires, and when subverted, these two, like Saul and Jonathan,⁶ lovely in their lives, in death are not divided. Look at any dead empire, and we discover the grave of that nation's hopes, temporal and divine. How is it in Central America, with a climate that might almost rival Eden? But what do we behold? Superstition muttering her incantations over the grave of pure religion; her civilization only the straggling rays peering into the sepulcher upon a nation's corpse; her people dwarfed by the capriciousness and instability of government, until her only befitting epitaph is, Dead while she liveth. What do we see better in Mexico? Nothing but the same degraded humanity; unfitted by the same causes to govern themselves; unfit to be subjects; civilization gone; her religion a stupendous system of corruption and fraud, preying on the vices and abominations of a most degraded people. But why dwell longer on the sickening picture? We have seen enough to convince us that there are no efforts too great, nor price too dear, to pay for the security and perpetuity of civil government, and no bribe for its overthrow that can do aught but reflect our madness. Would that we, as a nation, might learn wisdom, even at this late day, in the lessons of the past, and return to our loyalty to established order, and if corruptions invade the sacred places of our nation's power, let us drive them out, as the Master did the temple swindlers, from its threshold; but never be guilty of the amazing folly of tearing down this beautiful temple, which our fathers built and cemented with their blood, which they consecrated to the honor of their God—this magnificent structure, the wonder, admiration and hope of the world, merely to rid ourselves of its supposed or real corruptions. No, no. We will labor both to elevate our government and our sense of loyalty and devotion with it. We will seek, by the blessing of our fathers' God, for that blessed time when all the people of this once great and happy country will regard obligation to it a privilege, a source of elevation and happiness, and when, with a religious loyalty, we can say: Her statutes shall be our songs in the house of our pilgrimage.